This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

THE

MELBOURNE REVIEW.

VOL. I.

JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1876.

MELBOURNE:
SAMUEL MULLEN, 55 & 57 COLLINS STREET EAST.
1876.

[*The Right of Translation and Reproduction reserved.*]

K1.

224293

MELBOURNE:
J. AND A. M'KINLEY, PRINTERS,
QUEEN STREET.

CONTENTS.

A'Beckett, Hon. T. T.	A Twenty-five Years' Retrospect	280
Andrew, H. M.	Brain Waves	105
Bennett, Dr. George	A Journey to the Arfak Mountains	255
Bird, Rev. T. F.	The Basis of National Prosperity	93
Clarke, Marcus	The Story of the Eureka Stockade (Part I.)	32
,,	Abel Jansen Tasman	451
Duffy, Sir C. Gavan	Port Phillip ; a Preliminary Chapter in the Political History of Victoria	385
Ellery, R. L. J.	A Twelve Months' Leave	410
Gosman, Rev. A.	The Supernatural	164
Harrison, Thomas	Scientific Gossip	237
Hearn, Miss H. A.	Shakspere : The Life and the Plays	458
Legge, Rev. John	Chinese Literature	301
Martin, Arthur P.	The Drama as a Fine Art	57
M'Dougal, Thomas D.	Opening Letters in the Post Office	351
Morris, Edward E.	History and Geography	21
,,	The Melbourne University	192
Pirani, F. J.	The Parts of Speech	470
Potter, Rev. Robert	On the Relation of the State to Religious and Ecclesiastical Bodies in Victoria	3
Rusden, H. K.	Labour and Capital	67
Russel, Rev. A., Dean of Adelaide	The Supernatural	318
Spence, Miss C. H.	George Eliot	146
,,	Sir Richard Hanson	427
Stephens, J. Brunton	Mute Discourse	370
Strong, Rev. Charles	Norman Macleod	332
Strong, Professor H. A.	Translations from Plautus	231
Turner, Henry G.	An Episode in Californian Banking	84
Turner, Miss Martha	Letters and Letter Writers	177
Wanliss, T. D.	The European Situation	121

Address to our Readers	1
Australian Poetry	202
Colonial Question, The	476
Critical Notices	120, 251, 497
Parliamentary Reform	376
Political Future of Europe, The	38
Public Affairs in Victoria	111, 242

THE
MELBOURNE REVIEW.

To our Readers.

ERRATA.

Page 64, line 27, omit the word "a" before "great Elizabeth."

Page 114, line 37, for "compensation" read "co-operation."

solid character and of more permanent interest: thus, articles on Philosophy, Theology, Science, Art, and Politics will form the leading feature of the *Review.* It is moreover intended, and this will form one of its distinctive characteristics, to admit contributions of ability on any of these questions, no matter from what school of thought they may emanate;—the soundness of this eclectic principle having been demonstrated by the marked success of the only two English periodicals that have adopted it, the *Contemporary* and *Fortnightly Reviews.*

The social and intellectual development of Victoria is now sufficiently advanced to render such a periodical as has been indicated a desideratum to the daily increasing class of thoughtful

THE
MELBOURNE REVIEW.

To our Readers.

It is an old and reasonable custom in commencing an undertaking like the present to say a few words in explanation of its plan and purpose. In this instance it is the more necessary as the present venture is in many respects a novelty in these Colonies. It is true that several previous attempts have been made to acclimatise periodical literature in the form of Monthly Magazines, but these have been chiefly devoted to Fiction and light literature, and have consequently been brought into direct and unequal competition with our abundant supply of English periodicals, and with our own excellent weekly papers. This, together with the practice of dealing too exclusively with local topics of no intrinsic interest, has probably contributed in no small measure to their uniform want of success.

The conductors of the *Melbourne Review* will, as far as possible, avoid these presumed causes of failure. Though a certain amount of space will be reserved for Poetry and Belles-lettres, the main portion of its pages will be devoted to subjects of a more solid character and of more permanent interest: thus, articles on Philosophy, Theology, Science, Art, and Politics will form the leading feature of the *Review.* It is moreover intended, and this will form one of its distinctive characteristics, to admit contributions of ability on any of these questions, no matter from what school of thought they may emanate;—the soundness of this eclectic principle having been demonstrated by the marked success of the only two English periodicals that have adopted it, the *Contemporary* and *Fortnightly Reviews.*

The social and intellectual development of Victoria is now sufficiently advanced to render such a periodical as has been indicated a desideratum to the daily increasing class of thoughtful men and women, who it may be presumed are hardly satisfied with the necessarily brief and partisan treatment of important questions by the daily or even the weekly press.

There are moreover good grounds for believing that we have amongst us many persons holding original and valuable opinions, for the expression of which there is at present no fitting organ, who would gladly avail themselves of such an opportunity as will be afforded by the pages of the *Melbourne Review.*

In referring to the undue prominence given to local matters of no general interest as one of the causes of failure of previous Australian magazines, it must not be supposed that it is intended to exclude from the pages of the *Melbourne Review* articles on local subjects—provided they derive their value from their style and treatment, rather than from their containing allusions to places and names familiar to the Colonial reader. A principal source of interest in the *Review* will be owing doubtless to the fact that subjects of general and world-wide interest will be treated of from a Colonial standpoint, and by writers of Colonial education and experience.

It is gratifying to be able to announce at the outset that the conductors have already secured the literary assistance of gentlemen of widely known ability in their several provinces, whose names will be recognised as ample guarantees for the value of their contributions. It is due, however, to the several authors to state that they are responsible for their own articles only, and are not necessarily in accord with the general tenor of the *Review,* which seeks to cover the widest possible range of cultivated thought.

The conductors hope to receive the cordial support of all who desire to foster an original Australian literature, and who will not refuse a kindly recognition of such literary talent as may exist amongst them; to their friendly consideration the present appeal is addressed, and to their criticism the first number is now submitted.

ON THE RELATION OF THE STATE TO THE RELIGIOUS AND ECCLESIASTICAL BODIES IN VICTORIA.

THE relation of the State to the religions of the people is not a burning question in Victoria. Burning questions are those which require for their solution sharp and sudden methods. Questions of public policy are usually best solved by gradual methods. But they are sometimes left without solution too long. And then corruptions and abuses gather about them, and their condition becomes so bad that they cannot wait for gradual methods. Statesmen must either solve them at once, as readily as possible, even if it be roughly, or else they must keep their hands off them altogether. If a way of solution is not found, they become more and more burning until they solve themselves at last in a general conflagration.

Roman Catholic Emancipation was a burning question in the United Kingdom in 1829; Parliamentary Reform in 1832; the Corn Laws in 1845. All of these were dealt with promptly, and received either a full or a partial solution. Slavery was a burning question in the United States before the last decade. No statesman succeeded in solving it, and so it solved itself in conflagration. Church and State in Germany is a burning question now, and will very soon be so in England.

But Church and State in Victoria was never a burning question. And yet we imported from the mother country all the elements of the difficulty. Civil and religious and ecclesiastical matters have been for centuries closely interwoven in the laws of England, and these laws we brought with us to this country. The making of bishops, dioceses and provinces were matters of consideration in the councils of the earlier colonial governments. Indeed in some respects it seemed as if we were destined to reproduce the Church and State disease in an aggravated form. Religious bodies were much more evenly balanced in Victoria than in England, and it was evident from the beginning that no one of them could have a monopoly of State honours and emoluments here. And so it seemed at first as if the poet's prophecy which promised us

> "Creeds with chartered priesthoods unaccurst"

was about to be strangely falsified. It seemed as if we were not to have one chartered priesthood, but several. Indeed it seemed as if the case was about to be even worse than that. For a chartered priesthood may not always be a mere tool in the hands of the State. It may be independent of the State as a teaching body, and therefore, as long as its charter suffers it to be virtuous, it may be a power for good. The property of the English Church is mostly corporate and not State property, and that fact no doubt has given an element of independence to the English priesthood, and has made it necessary for statesmen to consult them in matters of ecclesiastical legislation, and so their faith and doctrine have been kept hitherto from sinking into mere government by-laws. But the churches of Victoria were without corporate property, and therefore the chartered priesthoods of Victoria could only have become a mere army of mercenaries, subject at all times and in every way to the dictation of a purely secular government.

We have no doubt that if State Aid to religion had continued for a few generations, such abuses and corruptions would have grown up in connection with it, that all good citizens, and especially those who value religion, would have risen up together to demand its abolition. But by that time vested interests would have built their nests in it, and it would have wound itself in and out of our institutions, and got so bound up with our national life, that it would have been very difficult indeed to touch it. And then Church and State would have become a burning question in Victoria.

But fortunately for our future history, the danger was foreseen and a method of averting it was discovered, while gradual methods were still the easiest as well as the best. That method had been adopted in the United States long before, and has worked successfully there for near a century now. Statesmen in that country had said from the beginning—let the State withdraw from all official connection with churches. Let churches work out their own purposes by whatsoever lawful means they consider the best. Like all other corporations, let them have the protection of the laws and all reasonable facilities of action, but no State privileges and no State responsibilities. Let them be "free churches in a free state." Let those who believe in the efficacy of religious ministrations, maintain those religious ministrations. Let priesthoods and ministries who claim to possess spiritual powers, come to an understanding with the people who believe in those spiritual powers. And let that understanding be effected without the interference of secular government or secular laws. Let the State no longer undertake to provide religious instruction for the people, and let the teachers of religion be no longer responsible for their teaching to the State. This is the principle of non-interference as applied to Church and State.

Our purpose in the present article is not so much to assail or defend this principle as to attempt some discussion of the more distant consequences of its application. Nevertheless we will say this much, that it is certainly entitled to a fair and hopeful trial. For the contrary principle has been tried long enough and has utterly failed. Surely if it may be said of any institution it may be said of State churches—"weighed in the balance and found wanting." What a long and dark catalogue of wars and persecutions is directly attributable to them. Even now we have Europe threatened with war arising out of the conflicting claims of priests and statesmen in the State churches of Germany, and in England the fury of party-spirit within the State church—a spirit which State patronage provokes and fosters—calls loudly for the remedy of disestablishment.

But even if State churches had never been tried and found wanting, there would still be much to be said for the principle of thenon-interference of the State with religion. A good deal might be said from the State point of view, and a good deal more we think might be said from the Church point of view. Whatever may be thought as regards those older forms of government which are now rapidly passing away from the civilised world, it might be urged that at least in a democratic state the object of government ought to be to stimulate people to think and act for themselves, and not to keep them in leading strings. But if a government provides a religion for the people, it puts a premium on abstinence from thought, in the very highest fields of thought, and it renders unnecessary the corporate action which is the due result of such thought. The effect is even worse than this, indeed; for if the State patronises one or more forms of religion, it gives those forms, be they better or worse, a great advantage in the eyes of the people, and so it puts a heavy clog upon freedom of thought. And without freedom of thought we hold it to be exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, for any man to get a firm grasp of true religion.

But besides, why should the State go out of its way to undertake so very delicate a responsibility? If you pay a servant on other people's account to do certain work for them, you are bound to see that he does the work satisfactorily. A State which pays churches incurs by so doing visitatorial responsibilities in regard of those churches, which it cannot neglect without *laches* of duty, and which it cannot discharge without constant risk of dangerous collision with church authorities.

But from the point of view of the Church, the argument in favour of non-interference is stronger still. Does the Church believe in her own Founder's words? He said, "My kingdom is not of this world." Is a kingdom "not of this world" to be maintained by State prestige, State patronage, and State sanctions? Is it right that such a kingdom should enter into *concordats* with the kingdoms of this world, in virtue of which it surrenders a part of its spiritual independence for money and rank? The true sons of the church will always indeed be the most loyal and dutiful subjects. But their loyalty ought always to be "for conscience' sake," because "the powers that be are ordained of God," and not because they are the chartered officers or the paid mercenaries of the State. But moreover, the churches ought always to be ready to resist for conscience' sake, if need be, as well as to submit. And human nature is such that it will be always more difficult for people to resist a government for conscience' sake, if their whole temporal welfare is at the mercy of government.

We think, therefore, that the non-interference of the State with the religions of the people is a just, fair, and expedient principle, and we think that it ought to be regarded especially by the churches with favour and hopefulness.

The first and most obvious consequence of the application of this principle was the abolition of State aid. If the State was not to interfere in religion, it was not, of course, to subsidise religion. The only question really remaining was in what way the abolition was to take effect. And the fact that the churches were allowed five years from the passing of the Act to prepare for the change, as well as an absolute title to their landed property, proves how far the question was from having reached the "burning point."

The five years have now elapsed and the principle is fairly under way, and it would be a great mistake to suppose that the abolition of State aid is the only consequence of its application. We believe that much more important consequences will follow which have scarcely as yet begun to develop themselves. And we think that the manner of their development will depend greatly upon the action of the churches.

The people of Australia, as we have already said, have brought with them to this country the laws of England. But in England there is a State religion; and in countries where there is a State religion, offences against that religion are offences against the State. But if there is no State religion such offences are no longer necessarily offences against the State. If non-interference with the religions of the people is to be the principle acted on by the Government, we shall have to distinguish between sins and crimes. The State will continue to punish crimes with temporal and material penalties, and the churches must be left to deal with sins by means of such spiritual censures as they may be able to wield. The different religious bodies are by no means always agreed as to what is or is not sin. The Jews think it sin to treat the seventh day of the week as a common day. All Christians think it sin to treat the first day of the week as a common day. Most Christians think secular work unlawful on that day, except in cases of necessity or charity. Some Christians think recreation unlawful on that day. Some Christians think certain other days of equal obligation with the first day of the week. Just so some Christians think it unlawful to baptize infants, and some Christians think it unlawful to eat meat on certain days.

It is obvious that if the principle of non-interference is to be acted upon, none of these differing parties can expect the State to enforce any of these opinions. The State cannot forbid people either to work or play on Sundays on the ground of either being sinful, any more than it can forbid meat to be eaten on Fridays or pork on any day, upon the same ground. Indeed, even if all the religious bodies were agreed in condemning a particular act as a sin, they still could not expect the State to punish it *on that ground.* They would have to show that it was also an offence against the person or property, or against public peace or decency. Suppose, for example, that a man were to hire a public hall and publicly announce a lecture in which he would undertake to prove that there was no God, all religious bodies would unite in condemning his act as a sin. But we do not see how they could expect the State to interfere to forbid him.

If the State is not to interfere with the religions of the people, then all opinions, as far as the State is concerned, have an equal right to express themselves.

Of course if a man should proceed to illustrate his opinion, whatever it was, by language which was indecent, or which tended to provoke a breach of the peace, he would become amenable to the State law. But this would be the case all the same whether the indecent or offensive language were used by theist or atheist, in defence of religion or against it. It follows, then, that whatever laws exist amongst us (such, for example, as Act 29 Car. II. c. 7; or 21 Geo. III., c. 47) by which sins are punishable as if they were offences against the State, must either be suffered to fall into disuse, or else repealed, or at least altered so as to be brought into accordance with the principle which governs our State action towards religion.

If the State is not to interfere with the religions of the people, then the State cannot punish one man for publicly maintaining that the world made itself, and that there is no life after death; or another man for giving a public entertainment on Sunday; or another man for eating meat on Friday; or another man for eating pork; or another man for administering baptism to an infant. Each of the actions named is sinful in the eyes of one religious body or another—some of them in the eyes of all. But none of them is an injury to person or property, or a violation of public decency, or provocative of a breach of the peace.

But now the repeal of all such laws will speedily carry us to a point where the State and the churches will find themselves upon the same ground, and where, in consequence, they must come to an understanding with each other if there is to be peace and goodwill between them.

For there are certain questions of the highest importance both to State and to Church, and as these come to be dealt with the principle of non-interference by itself will not fully solve them. There are different kinds of non-interference. If I and my neighbour are travelling on the same road, neither ought to interfere with the other. But neither ought to push forward regardless of the fact that the other has to use the same road. Now the State and the churches have often to use the same road, and if either insists upon ignoring the presence of the other, goodwill cannot be maintained between them.

The State *quâ* State is bound to be non-religious, but it is not bound to be anti-religious. Indeed we should rather say that it is bound not to be anti-religious. For if the State is anti-religious, it will make the churches disloyal. And it is not good statesmanship to make the churches disloyal.

Let us take an instance in illustration. Marriage is a matter of the highest importance both to the State and to the church. Marriage laws therefore are ground whereon there must be an understanding between the State and the churches, if there is to be goodwill between them. The principle of non-interference alone will not suffice to settle the question. What sort of non-interference is it to be?

Is the State in its dealing with marriage to be anti-religious, or is it simply to be non-religious? When the existing marriage laws were passed, the principle of non-interference had come to be understood as the governing principle of our legislation. And it was strictly applied in those laws. But it was not applied in a sense hostile to the churches. If it had been so applied, ministers of religion would not have been in any way referred to in the marriage laws.

The legislature would simply have required that all persons wishing to be married should come before the State registrars and make certain declarations and sign certain forms before them, and it would have been enacted that such persons and only such persons should be held to be legally married. Of course people who wished for the blessing of the church might go to a clergyman, but they must, in any case, go also to the registrar.

This would have been strictly in accordance with the principle of non-interference. But by such a course the State would have ignored the religious bodies altogether. It would have taken up not a non-religious, but an anti-religious attitude.

Means were found of avoiding this without any violence to the principle of non-interference. The Marriage Act of 1859 provided that all ministers of religion might on certain very easy conditions be recognised as registrars of marriages without salary. They would then be bound under penalties to see that the declarations and signatures required by the law were made and forwarded to the proper quarter, and each might add afterwards such religious ceremony as his church might order. The State said in effect to the churches—marriage is a matter of the highest concern to us, and we must deal with it in our own interests. But we are aware that it is matter of concern to you also, and we will so deal with it in our interests as not to make it difficult for you to deal with it in your interests also.

But we have said above that the repeal of all laws which punish sins as if they were offences against the State, will very soon bring us to ground like this where the State and the churches must come to an understanding if there is to be goodwill between them.

The weekly day of rest is certainly an institution of the highest importance to the churches. And we think that by a democratic people it will be held also to be an institution of the highest importance to the State also. If ever the laws permit the shop and the factory to be open on Sunday, there will begin to be a very loud outcry from some people who never go to church at all. The classes which it is the fashion to call the working classes (as if they were the only classes that worked) endeavour in this country to limit their daily hours of work to eight. We hold them to be quite right in this endeavour; they have had a good deal of success, and we wish them still more. We trust to see the Saturday half-holiday as generally conceded as the eight hours working day.

But if the shop and the factory come to be thrown open on Sunday, how will the Early Closing Association like it? But can we help allowing the shop and the factory to be thrown open on Sunday? Surely the State cannot continue to forbid work on Sunday on the ground that the Christian churches agree to regard Sunday as a divinely appointed day of rest. If the principle of non-interference is to be adhered to, the State must have nothing at all to do with the enforcement of a religious obligation as such. Some citizens do not believe in the divine obligation of the Lord's Day; and whether they believe in it or not, they cannot be punished by the State for disregarding such obligation.

At the same time, we think that it is quite certain that a weekly day of rest is such an immense advantage on other than religious grounds that a people who have experienced its benefits, and who have the making of the laws in their own hands, will never consent to give it up. It is evident then that here we have come to ground which is common to the State and the churches. The State will have its weekly day of rest. The people who compose the State will insist on having it. And on that day work must be stopped, except such work as is needed for the refreshment and recreation of the people. And that exception must be so limited as to guard any one class from being made the slaves of the other classes, and so deprived of the benefits of the institution.

But now, in making its own regulations about its weekly day of rest, the State may assume either the anti-religious or simply the non-religious attitude. It may say to the churches as it has already said with reference to the marriage laws—"We will deal with this question in our own interests; but we will so deal with it, nevertheless, as not to hinder you." Or it may disregard the churches altogether. The State Sabbath may be fixed on some day other than Sunday. On no other day, indeed, can the churches commemorate the resurrection of Jesus; but any other day will do as well for a public holiday.

And we have no doubt that many would be found in favour of such a change. Some would support it on the ground that it would "cripple ecclesiasticism." Measures of great importance have been supported on that ground before now. Many again who care nothing either way for "ecclesiasticism" would be glad of a weekly holiday on which religion would have no special claim.

On the other hand, the advantages of keeping the State Sabbath on the first day of the week are obvious. That day is already in possession, and changes, for the mere sake of change, are seldom good. And this change would be regarded with horror by all the religious bodies, with a single exception. It would compel all Christians who had any regard for their religion to keep, if possible, two holidays in the week instead of one, as the Jews have to do now. And some of them would have to do this with great loss, and some of them could not do it at all. And such a change, although it would be no violation at all of the principle of non-interference, would certainly be an application of that principle in a sense hostile to the churches, and it would provoke disloyalty to the State amongst the most peaceful and law-abiding citizens.

It will, therefore, be more advantageous to the State to keep its weekly holiday upon the first day of the week. Such a course will be politic and reasonable, and will not be in violation of the principle of non-interference.

And we have no doubt therefore that, except in one contingency, such will be the course that will be adopted. All the laws which have even the appearance of dictating a religious observance of Sunday, or which forbid people to use it as they would use any other public holiday, will be suffered to fall into oblivion or else repealed. But all the laws whereby the general course of business is suspended on Sunday will be kept in full operation. And all exceptions to the general rule, which are permitted on the score of necessity, will be watched with a jealous regard for the interests of the working classes.

And thus the Christian churches, under the full operation of a completely secular system of government, will continue to possess the great advantage of being set free from the cares of business on the Lord's Day, and they will of course possess as heretofore, in common with the rest of their fellow citizens, the fullest liberty to spend that day according to the dictates of their conscience.

We have said *except in one contingency*. For if any considerable section of the religious bodies should make a systematic attempt to impose the obligations of their own churches by force of law upon all their fellow-citizens—if they should invoke obsolete statutes for the purpose of getting Church rules enforced by the authority of the State, then one cannot say how far the probabilities now existing may be disturbed and altered. Once organise a series of prosecutions under the Act of Parliament which Mr. Higinbotham and Mr. Wrixon have so diversely interpreted, or under some other Act of similar purport; once obtain a few verdicts and a severe sentence or two, and it will be hard to say to what extent outraged public feeling may proceed. There is always a minority in the State ready to take up any cry against religion. Once give that minority power to prove that the churches are in a conspiracy to abridge the lawful liberty of the people, and they will soon get a majority to act with them against religion. It will be a small thing then to repeal a few obsolete Acts of Parliament. Nothing will satisfy people then but a complete reversal of all the State laws which recognise the Lord's Day.

We trust, however, that the general good sense of the religious bodies may be depended on to prevent any such catastrophe. There is, we believe, a prevalent disposition among them at present to set their own houses in order. And there can be no better augury for the future than such a disposition. There must be an end to handing people over to the secular arm; and the Churches, we think, are beginning to see this. And the consequence will be a furbishing up of spiritual weapons which have long been suffered to fall into disuse.

Church discipline in most of the Churches is all but non-existent. Church communion is in too many cases a thing that any man can have for the asking, and be thanked for taking, rather than a privilege to be sought for earnestly and obtained after due probation, and held only during good behaviour. Some of the churches, we believe, are beginning to cast about for a remedy for this evil, and if a few mistakes are made at first, it is not to be supposed, therefore, that such mistakes will be generally followed or persisted in long. Morality societies and Sabbath-observance lecturers may talk a little nonsense about Acts of Parliament, and about the obligation of the State to enforce religious observances; but we believe that what is really troubling them is the inconsistent conduct of members of their own churches, who disregard, in fact, rules of conduct which they profess to reverence.

And we are quite willing to admit that it is nothing short of scandalous that persons who call themselves members of churches, and who by their own confession ought to be at public worship every Sunday morning, should at that time be steaming about the Bay or strolling in the public gardens, or lounging in the Public Library. But then it is not the business of the State to deal with such scandals. Any attempt to do so would be to usurp the functions of the churches, and would be a gross violation of the principle of the non-interference of the State with the religions of the people. Besides, there are many of the people who are not members of churches, and who do not profess to acknowledge the obligations of public worship. And it must not be forgotten that such people have a perfect right, as far as their fellow-citizens are concerned, to steam about the Bay, or stroll in the gardens, or lounge in the Public Library, whenever due regard to other people's liberty admits of their doing so.

Let the churches punish those of their members who break church laws, with suspension of church privileges or expulsion from the church. It is only by a stricter internal discipline that the churches can chastise the inconsistencies of their own members. And they have no right to interfere with those who are not their own members. It is true indeed that any sustained endeavour on the part of any church to make discipline stricter would be followed by a great loss of numbers. If Mr. A. were deposed from the trusteeship of S. Silas's, or expelled from the managing committee of Stanley Church, because he made a practice of going to pic-nics during church time on Sunday; or if Mr. B.'s membership were suspended because he chose to marry his wife's sister, or because his wife were not his wife; and if during the continuance of such suspension no minister of the communion were allowed to baptize or marry or bury him or any of his children, we think that in that case Mr. A. and Mr. B. would most likely secede, and many sympathisers with them. But all, whether few or many, who hold membership with the church to be a high spiritual privilege, would nevertheless remain, and would cease to go to pic-nics during church time, or to marry their wives' sisters, or to have wives who were not their wives. And the church would have proved to the world that what it valued most highly, was not Mr. A.'s or Mr. B.'s money or countenance, but a certain high standard of principle and morals.

And what if a great loss of numbers did follow? We are not sure that the most serious source of weakness to the churches is not the great number of merely nominal followers that belong to them. A few earnest and constant members are dragged down by the dead weight of a host of hangers-on-for-fashion's-sake, whom they are unable either to control or expel. Nothing, in our opinion, would make more manifest the force and vitality of the churches, or make them more heartily respected by the world, than the knowledge that membership with any of them could only be retained by those who were consistent in their profession, and decent in their morals, and self-denying and active in their support of the Church. A very great loss of nominal members would be much more than atoned for, by the maintenance of rules which would ensure such results as these. The churches which exercised such discipline would soon become possessed of more power in the community than any number of nominal adherents, or any amount of State patronage, would ever confer upon them.

Once the bonds between the State and the churches have been fully and peaceably severed, and a free and independent relation fairly established between them, causes of contention will be less and less likely to arise. And, therefore, we may expect that as time goes on the State will be less and less disposed to legislate in a spirit hostile to the churches. Temptations to do so will, nevertheless, continue to exist. The friends and enemies of religion will endeavour to enlist the State on either side. The friends of religion, not being always wise in their generation, will try to win from the State something more than that friendly neutrality which is her most righteous and most politic attitude. And the enemies of religion will often ask the State, not merely not to interfere with, but absolutely to ignore the religions of the people. And the enemies of religion, being sometimes wiser in their generation than her friends, will often deal with the churches in detail, and bid for the support of some of them against that particular one which for the time they may have marked out for hostilities. And such strifes will make themselves felt in the world of politics, and will render it often very difficult for the State to maintain the principle of non-interference with any church in a spirit friendly to all churches.

There is one question especially, which is of the highest importance alike to the State and the churches, and which has been and always will be much more difficult to deal with in a fair spirit than either the marriage laws or the Sunday laws. That question is the education of the people. Neither State nor Church can be indifferent to education, except at peril to their lives. The intelligence of the people is the life-blood of a democratic State, and the degradation of that intelligence is blood-poisoning to the body politic. And of all forms of disease blood-poisoning is the most insidious and the most offensive. And surely a healthy intelligence is no less important to the churches than to the State; for although they propose to raise men to a higher and purer air than that of mere intelligence, yet men must make use of their intelligence in order to reach the more elevated region where that purer air is breathed. To neglect education while you try to teach religion, is to forget the scaffolding while you try to build the tower.

Education, therefore, is ground where State and Church must always meet; and as it is the most important and extensive of all such grounds, we may be sure that here especially the enemies and the false friends of religion will always endeavour to induce the State to interpret the principle of non-interference in a spirit hostile to the churches; whilst here, at the same time, the unwise friends of religion will endeavour to win from the State a support which would be in violation of that principle. We need hardly say that such attempts have been and are being prosecuted, and we need hardly say on which side the advantage at present rests.

The Education Act of 1872 has received more passionate praise and more passionate blame than perhaps any other Act that has ever passed the Victorian Legislature. Its worst enemies must admit that it discloses a very large and laudable purpose, and that it possesses many excellent points, even though they may go on to say that these points are not the points after all which secure it the most enthusiastic support. And its best friends must admit that it labours under the disadvantage of having called forth the determined opposition of certain classes of the community whom no wise politician ought to wish to provoke to permanent hostility. We have to do with it in the present article only under one aspect. Is it in accordance with the principle of the non-interference of the State with the religions of the people, and does it interpret that principle in a spirit hostile or friendly to religion? The interpretation must in this case be either hostile or friendly. For this is ground on which the State and the churches meet. And in such a case it is enmity on the part of either to ignore the presence of the other.

Education under the Act is compulsory, secular, and free. Does the Act in any one of these three points do violence to the principle of non-interference? Certainly not in the first. No friend of religion will deny that it is a parent's duty to educate his children, and that if he does not fulfil that duty he ought to be compelled to fulfil it. Only the enemies of religion will pretend that ignorance is an advantage to the churches. In the interest of the churches, and speaking from their point of view, we should hail compulsory education as a great boon.

And here we cannot but venture to travel for a moment from our record in order to point out briefly how, in our judgment, this great boon might be secured; for it is a universally admitted defect of the present Act that it is not so secured.

We say then that every parent in the State ought to be liable at any time to be called on to prove, at the instance of the proper authorities, that his children are being educated. Every man we believe may be called on to show that he has lawful and visible means of support, if the authorities have any reason to doubt the fact. And in that case the burden of proof rests with him. Why should not the burden of proof rest with him in the other case also? The State ought not to have to call any evidence at all. Let the State have the power to summon, by the officers of the Education Department, any man it pleases, before the magistrate, to show that his children are being educated. If he can show it to the satisfaction of the court, good and well; if not, let him be punished. There would probably be no danger at all of any vexatious prosecutions, just as there is no danger of a man being called on vexatiously to show that he has lawful and visible means of support. But if any such danger should disclose itself, it could easily be guarded against. We do not hesitate to say that any government that has the education of the people at heart will make some such alteration as this at the earliest opportunity. Compulsory education will then be a healthy fact.

But if the compulsory clauses of the Act are no violation of the principle of non-interference with religion, and are not conceived in any spirit hostile to the churches, we must surely say the same of the clauses which provide that State-given education must be secular and secular only. If the State were to undertake to teach religion in State schools, one of three courses only would be possible—either it would have to teach one of the religions now held by the people, or it would have to teach several of them, or else it would have to set up a new religion of its own distinct from all of them. The last course was in fact that proposed in the Education Bill brought forward and afterwards withdrawn by the M'Culloch and Higinbotham Government in 1870.

It need hardly be said now that all three courses are utterly indefensible, and that the last is the least defensible of all. The present writer remembers a conversation very much in point which he heard when he was a small boy—it was in a part of the country where two types of religion alone prevailed, one much more widely than the other, and where party-spirit very seldom ran high. Two boys were playing together, one of them, let us say, belonging to religion A, and the other to religion B. The subject of conversation was a third boy who had lately come on a visit to the neighbourhood. Said one boy, "What is he? is he an A or a B?" "Oh," said his playfellow, "he's neither, he's a C." "Then," said the other, fervently, "d— him, *there's enough of religions.*"

The sentiment was probably shared by a great majority of the people of this country when it was gravely proposed by an eminent politician that the State should teach in the public schools a religion that was not taught by any of the Churches.

It must be obvious that if non-interference is to be maintained, no religious teaching can be State-given; and, therefore, that State-given education must be secular, and secular only.

If, therefore, there is any violation of the principle of non-interference in the Education Act, we must find it in the last of its leading features, namely, that education under it is provided free for all, without reference to their ability or non-ability to pay for it.

Now the religious bodies are, no doubt, teaching corporations—education is one of their functions; and as long as there is any life left in them, they will be trying, with more or less of success, to fulfil that function. They never have had, and indeed they never could have in this country, a monopoly of education. Private individuals and corporations not religious would always be sure to divide it with them. But the State, by the present Education Act, has entered into competition with all the teaching bodies in the colony, whether private or public, religious or non-religious. And the State has not only entered into the competition, but it has declared the weights so effectually in its own favour as practically to put all competitors out of the running. Neither private individual nor corporation can teach for nothing. The State comes in and offers to teach for nothing, and so draws nearly all the work of education into its own hands, and disables either private persons or corporations from becoming the educators of any considerable section of the people.

We believe that this is the secret of the hostility which has been shown by some of the religious bodies to the Education Act. And we think that it must be admitted that in this particular the action of the State is conceived in a spirit hostile to religion.

Why should the State compete with the various teaching corporations of the country, whether religious or non-religious? There will always be teaching work enough which neither private nor corporate enterprise can overtake, and therefore which the State will have to do. Why go out of its way to bid for more?

It has been said, "If education is compulsory, it must be free." In the name of common sense, we ask why? The State compels a man, if he is able, to feed and clothe his children. Why should not the State also compel him, if he is able, to educate his children? Because the State insists upon all children being fed and clothed, is it therefore argued that the State is bound to provide food and clothes for them all? If not, how can it be argued that if the State insists upon children being educated it is bound to find education for them all? It is really time that this bubble were pricked. Let the State prosecute every man who does not have his children educated. Let every man choose for his own children whatever mode of education he pleases. Let him give them religious or non-religious education, just as he likes;—only let them be educated. If he can satisfy the magistrate that he is without means to educate them, then let them be sent to a State school; just as now if he can satisfy the magistrate that he cannot feed or clothe them, they are sent to an industrial school. And let the State in the State-schools give nothing but secular instruction. And let no child have admission to State schools but those whose parents have a magistrate's order setting forth that they are unable to have their children educated.

Does any one suppose that under such a system efficient instruction would not be provided, without costing the State a penny, for all children whose parents were able to pay a moderate school fee? Such instruction would be provided partly by private enterprise partly by the religious corporations—that is to say, by the churches —and partly by corporations not religious. The State would be relieved at once from a ruinous expenditure, and from all suspicion of hostility to the churches or any of them, the principle of compulsory education would remain intact, and all State-given education would still be secular only. For whatever religious instruction would be given in the few State schools that would remain would have to be provided by the churches at their own cost, with the permission of the State.

The Education Department would then have just three duties to perform. The first and most important would be the enforcement of the compulsory clause. The second would be the management of the half-score or so of State schools which would be necessary for those children whose parents are unable to pay school fees. And the third would be the inspection of all such private and corporate schools as chose to apply for certificates of efficiency. If such certificates were offered, all schools would find it necessary to obtain them, if they hoped to succeed in the public competition for the education of the people which would be at once established.

It will be said perhaps that in that case the education of the people would ultimately fall into the hands of one or two dominant sects. Our answer is threefold. In the first place—what is that to the State, if the State is not to interfere with the religions of the people? In the second place—if any such result were brought about, it could only be by "the survival of the fittest," and would in effect be the expression of the people's will. And lastly—no such thing would happen, for private enterprise and non-religious corporations would always compete with the churches for the education of the people.

In our treatment of the question which we have discussed in the present article, we are aware that there is one point, and we believe that there is only one, in which we are out of accord with a considerable section of the liberal party. We mean of course the liberal party not of the colony only but of the Empire. That one point is "free education." We do not believe that the State ought to provide education for those who are confessedly able to provide it for themselves, because we think that in doing so the State enters into unfair competition with all persons and corporations one of whose functions is education. Other reasons for our belief might of course be given but this one alone concerns the subject of this article.

But notwithstanding this belief of ours, we claim to belong to the centre, if not to the left centre, of the party of progress. We hold that the plank we reject is not essential to the liberal platform, and we invite liberal leaders to consider whether it has any right to be there at all.

On behalf of religion we plead for liberty—liberty of thought, liberty of conscience, and liberty of competition. We ask for the impartial goodwill of the State for all the religious corporations which have a lawful existence in her midst.

In a State such as ours, as long as the world is what it is, there will always be persons of many differing religions, and persons of no religion. And such persons cannot be fairly governed except on the principle of non-interference with the religions of the people. And such principle ought to be interpreted with at least as much friendliness as not to ignore the existence of those religions.

Such principle, so interpreted, involves all that we have pleaded for.

ROBERT POTTER.

HISTORY AND GEOGRAPHY.

FIFTY years ago the type of the higher education in England was the ordinary country grammar-school. Generally it was not a large school in point of numbers; it was not expensive, even in those cases where to foundationers it was not absolutely gratuitous. There was no luxury of class-rooms, but in one large school-room sat at the further end the head master with due dignity of daïs almost enthroned; at the nearer end, nigh the door whence he obtained his name, sat the usher. The education consisted wholly of classics and mathematics. Far be it from me to say that the teaching was not often very good. I am sure that it was, and in so saying I am not a *laudator temporis acti*, when I was a boy, for I am speaking of days long before. In neither subject was the teaching as good as the best teaching of to-day; it was not so scientific; it had not instruments made to its hand that we have in excellent text-books. But it surely trained the reasoning faculties of our fathers and their taste. With greater concentration, more time was given to these subjects, and more time meant the study or at any rate the reading of more of the great classical models.

Then there came a change. Men felt that the same standard was not wisely applied to all, and that as the human mind varies widely, even the mind of boys, so it would be better to introduce more subjects into the school course. The exact order in which they were introduced matters not. When the demand was once heard that the curriculum should be widened, and when that demand was made by the public, that is, by the parent and the paymaster, the school authorities, with or without misgivings, with or without resistance, complied. These were the new subjects: Modern languages, especially French, history and geography, English composition in some form or other, and later English literature. Now science also stands at the door and knocks; nay, perhaps it were truer to say that she has parleyed with the porter, and that he has at length agreed to admit her, but he hesitates about her apparatus; yet without it she is worse than useless.

Nor was it only in the grammar schools that the cry was heard to lengthen the cords and strengthen the stakes. The universities, Oxford first, made new arrangements to meet the new subjects. And in the lower schools, it has no longer been thought sufficient to teach what by a strange witticism all men now call the three R's. In them also history and geography are taught, and as a consequence are subjects for examination.

We may fairly ask what is the reason why history and geography are taught in schools. Partly it must have been for the sake of the knowledge. It was felt that boys should not go forth from school, ignorant of ordinary well-known simple facts in the history of their country or the simple facts about their own and other countries. Yet facts of history are remembered but by few; witness the repeated assertion in an English paper, that most educated Englishmen confuse Thomas with Oliver Cromwell. But those who recognise the ease with which the best regulated facts escape the memory, yet recommend the study of history and geography on the ground that it enlarges the mental horizon, and educates the sympathy. We are all narrow enough, and it does us good to hear of great deeds done in distant times or distant lands, such as our own circle dreams not of. It teaches us not

> "To take the rustic cackle of our burgh,
> For the great wave that echoes round the world."

And if the study serves this purpose, it is surely wanted now. Our times, as much as any, require the education of the historical mind. The subjects have taken deep root in every school course.

Now again opinions are changing. Opponents are arising who would sweep both subjects away. Some because school-time is short, and to them the claims of other subjects are stronger. Some, like Professor Bain, consider history unfit for the immature minds of the young, as well as so intrinsically interesting that it will be studied for its own sake. But there is yet a third class, like a writer in a recent number of the *Monthly Journal of Education*, who believe in the subjects, but despair of any improvement in the methods of teaching, fostered as they are by the baneful influence of examinations, and who think that without such improvement the subjects are worse than useless. I, if I may speak of myself, have sympathy with the last class, though I do not belong to it. It is too soon, surely, to speak of despair. Yet have I been drawn two steps nearer to it; first, when able men and women, under the guidance of a most distinguished historian, entered the ranks of the enemy; secondly, when I found that the matriculation examination bound Melbourne educators hand and foot and handed them over as victims.

And who is this giant that stands in the path? Whom go we forth to slay? As was said of Pitt—"Letters four do form his name." It is CRAM, the curse of modern education, the tyrant who does more to harm it than any other, who is wondrous strong, making all to follow in his train, carrying them whither he will.

It is against him I pick out my smoothest pebble and my strongest sling.

But, dropping metaphor, what is meant by Cram, and why does it harm education? The highest kind of education is that which trains the faculties; that is lower which aims at the imparting of knowledge. But the training of the faculties must be in proportion, not an undue training of one. Without pretending to a complete psychological analysis, one may say that education should train the reason, the taste, the sympathies, and the memory. Cram trains the latter only, and even this work it does badly. Cram means the acquisition of knowledge only for the purpose of presentment for examination. It is trying to build Rome in a day, to acquire her history in a few weeks.

Some years ago (in 1859) Mr. Brudenell Carter, now ophthalmic surgeon to St. George's Hospital, published an article in the Journal of Psychology. It was afterwards published separately, and in May last it was re-published in the *Monthly Journal of Education.* The title is suggestive, and I venture to think that if those interested in education as parents or as schoolmasters will procure and peruse it, it will well repay them—" On the Artificial Production of Stupidity in Schools." All must allow that the natural supply is sufficiently large, though far be it from me to reproduce and apply to our own circumstances Mr. Carlyle's well-known description of the population of England, " thirty millions, mostly fools." But if the natural supply be large enough, surely it is of importance to consider the methods by which the supply is being artificially increased. I wish my readers to read the article for themselves; but I may reveal this much of the secret:—If you wish to make the young stupid, force them to learn things that they cannot understand, or in which they take no interest. I will only quote this passage as making for my argument:—

> " The teacher ignores the great truth that cultivation of mind is necessary to the assimilation of learning. He imagines that the introduction of compressed facts will mechanically expand the intellect. Upon this last false principle, Master Thompson, in this 19th century, and in the ninth year of his age, is forcibly and tyrannically inducted into various kinds of knowledge, in the hope that all the teaching and lecturing and cramming, all the scraps of science, bundles of facts, odds and ends of common things, Greek verbs, Latin verbs, German verbs, French verbs, Scripture history, ancient history, modern history,

natural history, rules of syntax, rules of arithmetic, rules of algebra, and rules of conduct, the propositions of Euclid and the theory of ventilation, the *rationale* of catarrh and the law of storms; that all these matters will eventually, like the talk of S. T. C., 'converge in light,' and coherently illuminate a full grown Thompson, possessed of sufficient ballast for his sails, sufficient parts for his attainments, and sufficient brains for the application of his learning."

There is, of course, much exaggeration in this picture. We do not teach so much, nor to boys so young. But I have no manner of doubt that in modern education the memory is too much exercised at the expense of all other faculties.

Geometry and composition in a foreign language train the reason. The former teaches how steps follow one another—the latter teaches the application of laws. Translation, the reading of good authors, classical or English, trains the taste. The learning of poetry, it carefully observed, trains the memory, which should also receive incidental training with all the other work. I claim the field of history and geography for widening the sympathy. Learning Euclid by heart is worse than useless. Learning "the crib," as moderns call a translation of an ancient author, is worse than useless: yet it is a practice not unknown in schools. The word "clientelæ" was by a generally intelligent boy, nay by two, translated chientages. It is unnecessary to state there is no such word in English, but there is a misprint in Dr. Giles' admirable translation of Cicero De Senectute at the passage. Learning history or geography by heart is likewise worse than useless; but I doubt if I carry my readers with me here.

That boy has learnt only a meaningless list of names, who can repeat the names of all the capitals of Europe by rote, and knows nothing of the Thames embankment, or the Unter den Linden, of the Forum, the Colosseum, or the Tuileries, nothing of the dome of St. Peter's or St. Paul's, of the Golden Horn, of the Exhibition at Vienna. I attach no value whatever to a string of names, even though such string, afterwards remembered, be then found of use. Rather than stuff them with names, I would prefer that in one term boys learnt only to have a true notion of one river valley, say the Rhine, if they could tell of its rising in the Alps, of its colour from the glacier water, of the splendour of the falls at Schaffhausen, of its noble bend at Basle, of its ferry boats that the stream bears across, of Ehrenbreitstein and Strasburg and Cologne, of the iron foundries of the Ruhr Valley, of the German love for it, of the French desire to obtain it; that they grasped the notion that rivers were bad boundaries, and the reason.

So also in history, it is better to learn little, and learn that little fully, than to know the names of all the sovereigns since the Conquest. Of all learning, the most useless, unless exercised with judgment and discretion, is the learning of dates. As an examiner I would give more marks for an approximate date, with reasons for its selection, than the exact date learnt by rote.

A recent writer in an English educational journal has wittily said that the verb to cram is a defective verb, that it lacks the first person, that whilst every one says you cram or they cram, nobody will acknowledge "I cram." *Habet confitentem reum.* Active and passive, singular, and, with the aid of colleagues, plural. I have been crammed—that, I am happy to say, is wholly past. I have learnt for purposes of examination, and speedily forgotten; but I intend for the future always to sit on the right side of the examination table. But take the other voice, and I confess—I cram, have crammed, and, unless examinations be altered, and the nightmare removed, I will again. I hate it. I sincerely hope that it is a plant of parasitical growth on my general notions of education. I know it is. Lightly come, lightly go. I am sure that whatever is of slow and steady growth will stand best in the day of trial. But you, the outside public, the universities, the Government it may be, demand that boys shall pass examinations. You say, and with much reason, that you want an external test of our work. We submit. Within six weeks or a month before the examination we discover that this boy and that, to whose future it is of importance that they should pass, have weak joints in their harness, say are wholly ignorant of Greek history or of geography. What remains but to make them get up the subjects unintelligently? It was old advice, "*si possit recte, si non quocunque modo.*" First by means of education, but failing that, by means of its counterfeit, by what is facetiously termed a "ram and cram," by causing them to learn without understanding, "with brains," if possible; if not, without them. The operation is degrading to perform. But I unhesitatingly aver that the responsibility for it rests on those who organised the examination or who insist upon its adoption rather than on us. It rests on those who invented and placed upon us a burden greater than our shoulders are able to bear.

It is probably fair to say that at schools in Victoria neither history nor geography can be taught, or are taught except with a view to the matriculation examinations. Therefore we stop to consider the nature of these examinations as far as these subjects are concerned.

There are two ways in which an examination may help or hamper the teacher: Firstly, by the questions set, and secondly, by the subjects or text-books selected. A wise and intelligent examiner who desires to assist intelligent teaching and to defeat cramming, will have an influence very far-reaching, for those, who teach the subject with the examination in view, will consult past papers, and will shape their teaching accordingly. In the same way a bad paper fosters bad teaching. First, to take an instance far away, in a kindred examination, the Cambridge locals, there once occurred in a Scripture paper a question of this sort—

> "Give the names of all the kings of Israel, with the length of time that each reigned, and the date of each."

This, perhaps, the model of a bad question, is simply playing into the hands of the crammer; it is defeating all the intelligent objects of teaching. It is easy to make a table and insist on all the boys in a class being able to repeat the whole of it by rote—exhorting, threatening, punishing until they can, although the teacher may know that they are none the better for it when they can say it perfectly. It is far harder to excite interest, from slight indications to draw out the traits of a king's character, to show a cause producing an effect, to illustrate from kindred sources. The latter has an educational value, the former has not. And yet it is almost impossible to calculate the evil effect of that silly question. About 3000 boys present themselves annually for the examination. Often they are the picked boys of their schools, and the whole of the classes to which they belong are taught what they are taught. It would probably be under, not over the mark to say that, when next the books of Kings are set, 15,000 boys will learn that senseless table. Much good may it do them!

But nearer home, in the last calendar of Melbourne University, an historical volume that has long been out of print, stands a paper in every question of which dates are asked. Some are important, some unimportant. But to be able to answer all the dates in two histories, together with all dates of similar importance, would require a knowledge of all the dates in the books. One of the dates given is wholly ludicrous. It is the date of an event which never took place, for it is mythical—the return of the Heracleidæ. It were as fair to ask the date of King Arthur and the Round table—I had almost said of—Jack and the Beanstalk.

An examiner may help or hamper also by his subjects. He may select important epochs and concentrate attention upon them, or may fritter the attention over a long range. He may give an amount which it is impossible to cover except in the most meagre outline. He may insist on text-books, or he may leave the teacher free. In the English local examinations the authorities do not stipulate actual books. A forced sale of 15,000 copies of one book would seem too enormous an advantage to give to one author or one publisher. Teachers may use what machinery they like, crammer's outline, or intelligent history, Freeman or Green, lecture or text-book. It is free trade. In these examinations a period is set, usually a short period for full handling, and a general outline required of the whole history of England, but only an outline. In Melbourne, protection is the order of the day. The whole history of two of these three—England, Greece, Rome, is required, and definite books are set; these and no other. In geography questions often assume the form—"What does your text-book say?" "Give any information given in your text-book." "*This* path if you please, gentlemen—no straying."

We pass therefore to consider the discrimination that has been displayed in the selection of books. The geography recently in use is entitled the Civil Service Geography. What does this mean? It is avowedly a cram-book. It containeth just so much geography as (and no more than) is sufficient to make the student that learneth diligently, pass an examination and become one of Her Majesty's civil servants. It is not by the author of "Civil Service Tots," as are many other works whose titles commence with the honourable words, Civil Service. His contribution to geographical science is called by the expressive name—Competitive Geography.

This work has been pushed off the board, and has been succeeded by Mackay's Geography, a cram book, not so open and barefaced, but as genuinely belonging to the class. It does give a little information about some of the places that it mentions. But others are ranged in lists, and left to take care of themselves. Every page bristles with statistics, of such a kind that no head can possibly retain them. Both books, Spence and Mackay, treat Australia with such neglect, not to say with such palpable inaccuracy, that those who selected the books were bound to add to their notice that the student must obtain "similarly minute information about Australia." Herein he has his freedom,—this he may obtain whence he will.

The examination in geography has, however, its redeeming feature in physical geography. This is a subject which cannot well be crammed, and in which intelligent teaching must avail. If it were fair to say so, it would seem as if the examiner believed in physical geography, and only threw in a few political questions for the sake of decency, performed that part of his work half heartily and not *con amore.*

With respect to the history books, one can only say that they seem to be selected as the best representative books of the cramming theory. In this sense they are good. *Corruptio optimi pessima.* It is because they are good they are dangerous. They are written in the light of a false theory, and it is no cowardice to attack them. If the object be to collect as many facts into as short a space as possible, the histories by Dr. Edward Freeman and Miss Edith Thompson attain their object admirably. If pemmican be good food, marry, sirs, here is historical pemmican. But if you wish to excite interest, to stir the blood in English pulses, when English boys read of the deeds of their English forefathers, if you wish them to learn how great crimes bring great retributions, how misgovernment of kings brings misery to their people, how English liberties were won and what names we ought to honour for their winning, commend me rather to Mrs. Markham.

The four histories—of Europe by Dr. Freeman, of England by Miss Thompson, of Greece and Rome by Dr. William Smith—are all summaries. The two latter have larger brothers, books that contain the histories of these two countries, written more at large. Events that are of interest when fully described have no interest when crowded into a few lines; the life is taken out of them. The writer of a summary seems never willing to omit events or men altogether. He will describe them in a very short space, but that is the utmost to which he will consent. He cares not that he spoils the picture by crowding his canvas.

It would be easy to multiply examples. I would spare them, if I did not fear to be thought to speak without reason.

Elegant extracts from Dr. Smith's smaller History of Greece:—

> "Anaxilas, tyrant of Rhegium, about B.C. 500, was of Messenian descent. He seized the Sicilian Zancle on the opposite coast, and changed its name into Messana, which it still bears."—p. 43. "The metopes between the triglyphs in the frieze of the entablature."—p. 92. "Cyrus passed in succession the Phrygian towns of Peltæ, Ceramon Agora, the Plain of Cäyster, Thymbrium, Tyriœum, and Iconium, the last city in Phrygia."—p. 142.

A boy has a chapter to get up: these names occur in it: the industrious boy learns them by heart. What does it profit him if he knows them perfectly? and how long can he retain them? What will the effort cost him? Try, gentle reader, yourself, or try the following passage:—

> "Both Antigonus Gonatas and his son, Demetrius II., who had reigned in Macedonia from 239 to 229 B.C., were now dead, and the government was administered by Antigonus Dōson as guardian of Philip, the youthful son of Demetrius II. Antigonus Dōson was the grandson of Demetrius Poliorcetes and the nephew of Antigonus Gonatas. The Macedonians compelled him to accept the crown; but he remained faithful to his trust as guardian of Philip, whose mother he married; and though he had children of his own by her, yet Philip succeeded him on his death. It was to Antigonus Dōson that Aratus applied for assistance; and though Cleomenes maintained his ground for some time, he was finally defeated by Antigonus Dōson in the fatal battle of Sellasia in Laconia (B.C. 221). The army of Cleomenes was almost totally annihilated: he himself was obliged to fly to Egypt; and Sparta, which for many centuries had remained unconquered, fell into the hands of the victor."—p. 216.

That is what I call history with the juice taken out. Is it possible to imagine anything more dry? This passage is not from a dictionary of dates, but from the Greek History set for the matriculation examination at Melbourne. Perhaps I may be spared further extracts, but I must add that on the same page at the foot is given a list of the Macedonian kings from Alexander the Great to the extinction of the Monarchy, with dates complete. Probably not one in a hundred of the readers of this *Review* could mention the name of one. I know the entire absence of educational value in this sort of stuff, but I do not believe that the majority of history teachers in Melbourne would have the courage to say as I had—"*We will skip this rubbish.*" Compare this with the educational value of Macaulay's Clive.

Of Dr. Freeman I wish to speak with respect. I hold him to be the greatest of English historians, even though the names of Carlyle and Froude are on the list. Next to the great Leopold von Ranke, I hold him to be the greatest of living historians, though the claims of Thiers and V. Sybel are very strong. I have learnt much from him for which I am thankful. I have followed him even in his fancies, and learned, with fear of the *Saturday Review* before my eyes, to speak of Charles the Great instead of Charlemagne; English instead of Anglo-Saxon; Eadward for Edward, in early times—though I have come amongst a people that know not of these fancies, or knowing, honour not.

My complaint against Dr. Freeman is this—that "with a light heart" he has entered on a war for which he was not prepared. It is quite true that his name carries so much weight that his series has forced its way. Yet I maintain that he had not carefully thought out the question before he started, and that he had no experience to guide him. "Clear and correct views in the simplest language and in the smallest space;" that was his idea. The result is that he has produced a book, many a page of which will give a headache to him who reads it. He knows history magnificently with the erudition of a German; and to his research in his other books he adds the fire of enthusiasm and the force of persuasion. For the young, he has thought these out of place; so they are presented with the skeleton of that which interests those older. I imagine very few now take in the general sketch,,except the unfortunate candidates for an exhibition, who with much else, are required to take in all the four cram-books.

I therefore pass to a criticism of Miss Thompson's book. Dr. Freeman, the editor, has in his preface, passed a high encomium upon it. He says that it is the result of genuine work among the last and best lights on the subject. It is thoroughly trustworthy. It gives clearer and truer views on most of the points on which clear and true views are specially needed, than can be found in any other book on the same small scale. On these matters, Dr. Freeman is an authority. I am not. So perhaps it is of little importance for me to add that I agree with him. But I say that it shares all the faults of the series, that events are so tersely described as to be fatally uninteresting; that judgment has not been exercised in the matter of omission.

Elegant extracts from Miss Thompson's history of England, all involving the introduction of unnecessary names:—

"Egbert was succeeded in 838 by his son Othelwalf, and he by his four sons, Æthelbald, Æthelbert, Æthelred the first, and Ælfred (or as we now write it, Alfred.) . . . . . "A great heathen army, under the command of Ingvar and Ubba, said to be sons of Ragnar"—p. 12.

"Godwin . . . . . who had married Gytha, sister of Ulf, Cnut's brother in law"—p. 23.

"After the king's death, Marchadee, the leader of his mercenaries"—p. 55.

"Julyans or Juliana Berners, said to have been prioress of Sopewell Nunnery, near St. Alban's, was the authoress of treatises upon hunting and hawking"—p. 110.

"Thomas Percy and Charles Neville, Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, raised a Roman Catholic rebellion in the North"—p. 134.

"The Earls of Shrewsbury, Devonshire and Danby, Lord Lumley, Henry Compton, Bishop of London, Admiral Russell and Henry Sidney"—p. 178.

"At the end of 1845, and again in 1848, there were wars with the Sikhs of the Punjaub, ending by the victory of Goojerat, won by Lord Gough, February 21st, 1849, and the annexation of the Punjaub to the British dominions. To these was added, in 1852, the province of Pegu, taken from the Burman Empire"—p. 239.

"LITERATURE.—Among authors (living writers not being taken into account), Thackeray, Dickens, and Lord Lytton, are to be noted as novelists. Thomas Arnold and George Grote are distinguished for their histories of Rome and Greece; Henry Hart Milman, Dean of St. Paul's, for the History of Latin Christianity"—p. 242.

These are not extracts from Mangnall's questions, but from the History of England set for the University Matriculation.

I may perhaps return to the subject of the Matriculation Examination in its more general aspect another time. I leave this question in the hands of the public and of the authorities of the University. Amongst the members of the Council, there are many men who can appreciate the force of my remarks; there is one whose opinion on this subject is of great value. There is one who has made his mark as an English historian as well as a teacher of history; who has written a book on English history which is used in many places as a text-book; who on a portion of English history is perhaps the greatest living authority. On the subject which I have in these pages been treating, I would unhesitatingly accept the verdict of Mr. C. H. Pearson.

EDWARD E. MORRIS.

THE STORY OF THE EUREKA STOCKADE.

STANDING in the month of October, 1854, upon the hill which overlooks Ballaarat, we see a curious sight. In the flat beneath us, and far away above and over the opposite rise, stretch lines of white tents, interspersed with wooden buildings. The tents are surrounded on all sides by red heaps, like gigantic molehills. From behind these molehills emerge from time to time yellow figures, bare-armed and bearded. Through the midst of these figures runs a stream, and on the banks of the stream ten thousand cradles—sometimes six abreast—whirr, hum, and sing. An immense clashing, as from a million brazen grasshoppers, arises up out this valley of cradles, and a light breeze blowing from the east lifts clouds of red dust, which powders the sparse herbage. On the hill floats the flag which marks the Government Camp, and here and there flashed the scabbards of the mounted-police inspecting licenses.

This inspection of licenses was the grievance of the day at Ballaarat in October, 1854. No man was permitted to dig for gold without paying a monthly fee in the shape of a payment of at first thirty shillings, then sixty shillings, and then again thirty shillings for a gold license; and Governor Sir Charles Hotham just issued an order that the police should go two days a week "digger hunting." There were at that time no less than four Commissioners at Ballarat, and the troopers had their work cut out for them. It being once determined that no man should mine without a license, it was but reasonable that authority should support itself. The diggers, however, resented this interference with their liberties; and officialdom proceeding, with some ill-judged display of silver-lace and bullion-tags, to the enforcement of the law, it became a humorous point of honour to resist the "license business" to the utmost. Both diggers and police must be debited with the commission of many follies. The nature of the digger of that period was not understood by the red-tapists until too late. Dreaming of San Joaquin and San Francisco, the Government imagined the population of Ballaarat to be composed wholly and solely of adventurers, reckless, extravagant, and given over to debauchery. The gold-fever had attracted—as greed of gain will always attract—many ruffians, knaves, and fools. New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land—or Tasmania, as it had been lately rechristened—sent out their quota of emancipated and escaped convictism, eager to plunder and defraud.

Among the shiploads that landed daily at Liardet's Beach, it would be strange indeed if some few desperadoes did not mingle. But the majority of the diggers were honest, bold, and law-loving,—as Mr. Withers says, "of the best men of the best towns of Christian Britain, men of invincible spirit, as of moral and law-abiding principles." The mad extravagance which was a characteristic of these digging days, was confined to those besotted idiots, who, in more placid times, booze themselves blind with threepenny beer, and squander the earnings of a six-weeks' shearing in the nearest bush grog-shop. The mob of gaudily-dressed men and women who—yet living in Gill's Hogarthian sketches—thronged the streets of Melbourne, and formed the staple of "English correspondents'" highly-coloured pictures of Australian life, are not to be confounded with the large-hearted, quick-souled men, whose minds, muscular as their bodies, impatient of the bonds of red-tapery, asserted and achieved freedom,—the men who founded and maintain the intelligent democracy of Australia.

The red-shirted, bearded men, who were summoned to show their permit to toil, had perhaps been, six months before, doctors, collegians, soldiers, men of fortune; independent miners of Cornwall, accustomed to rules, and abiding by recognised authority; intelligent artizans of Edinburgh and Glasgow; sturdy farmers of Kent; enthusiastic Irishmen; impatient Americans, or shrewd, dare-devil Cockneys, viciously tenacious of the liberty of Bow Bells. To deal with this body of men, what had the Government provided? A number of "relations," who demanded to be provided for! Let us say it without offence—for among the officials of that day were many honourable gentlemen, who discharged a difficult duty with temperance and justice—the Government had run riot upon its patrimony of patronage. To be made a Government official was easy, if one was an officer of either service, or owned a second cousin distantly related to the aristocracy. Materials for a police were scarce, and the majority of the constables had seen service—in two capacities—in Van Diemen's Land. The Government, moreover, committed the fatal error of thrusting upon men, inclined by age and circumstance to the freedom of democracy, that intemperate display of epaulettes and shoulder-knots which is only justified by the necessity for a military despotism.

The mounted police, bedizened with silver lace and officered by young gentlemen not altogether free from that melodramatic weakness for display which characterises the young soldier, was not by any means in accordance with the temper of the gold-fields. The cadets—smoking their pipes over Grant's novels, or mentally likening themselves to Tom Burke or Harry Lorrequer—cultivated a proper contempt for the "diggers" who only worked, and did not always collect the obnoxious tolls with that courtesy which a perusal of the Leverian code of gentility might be expected to create. Combats—not altogether bloodless—took place between these fiery spirits and the men over whom they were placed in brief authority; and in October, 1854, the spectacle of thirty or forty men, handcuffed like criminals, and mounted guard over by a stripling, whose birch scars yet caused him to sit uneasily in his regulation saddle, was not unfrequent. The cadets were generous boys enough, but as rulers of full-grown men, they were quite out of place.

Against this military rule of Sir Charles Hotham the diggers were awkwardly organising committees of defiance and resistance, when the accident of a bar-room riot brought the various rays of indignation into a focus. The population of the tented and wooden town was not wholly composed of the honest, hard-working digger. He —honest fellow—lived with his mates in one of the tents along the hill-side, and surrounded himself with all sorts of devices to obtain and conceal his treasure. When he desired "a spell," he would smoke his pipe at his door, or go down to the "music-hall" and listen to "Thatcher the Inimitable," who (the forerunner of the Great Vance, the Wondrous Leybourne, or the Marvellous Rickards) sang songs concerning popular vices, and freely commented upon unpopular authorities. With such entertainment, and a casual "liquor," the typical digger was satisfied. Being of one sort, it was possible that he had a wife and children; being of another sort, it was more than probable that he had occupied in Europe the position of a gentleman, and scorned vulgar and coarse dissipation. If he desired to gamble, he could gamble with Dickey Jones of the Blues, Tom Neville of the Foreign Office, and the Honourable Hamilton Hamilton, who "chummed" together in a tent at "The Frenchmans."

The rude ruffian of the lower stratum had more extensive delectation provided for him. For him blazed the bar of the Australia Felix; for him smiled the blowsy sirens of the Salle de San Francisco; for him were spread the fascinations of Monte, Faro, and Poker; to him the American Restaurant, with its three hundred plates, forty waiters, card-room, and drinking bars, poker, bagatelle, and billiards, stood invitingly open; for him gleamed the tallow candles of Coppinger's Californian; for him rolled the balls in the Bobell's Bowling Alley; and for him was initiated the nightly riot at the Eureka. This last place was the resort of the lowest ruffians on Ballarat. In the crowd of Americans, Germans, Italians, Chinese, English, there were some of the worst scoundrels in the colonies. Beneath the surface of respectable diggerdom lay this muddy and foul substratum of ex-convicts, rascals, swindlers, and thieves. For such folk the "Eureka" provided entertainment, and with such ill-gotten gains was the landlord enriching himself. The gentry who stole "washing" stuff, or washed surreptitiously their neighbours' "tailings," the sneaking dogs who crawled under tent flaps and extracted gold-dust by the matchboxful, the merry fellows who "jumped" the claims of the innocent or the timid, the fraudulent gold buyers, the loafers, the drunkards, and the jail birds, held high jinks at the "Eureka," and vowed Landlord Bentley was the roaringest of pot-companions. In addition to the character of its patrons, strange tales were whispered concerning the place. Not only—it was hinted—did no honest man go there, but that, did such folk, with well-lined belts, by accident seek supper and a bed, it was more than probable that they would meet with the usual digger's accident, and "fall down a deserted shaft"—to the intense grief and amazement of Bentley, it need not be added. Let us add to these suspicions the fact that Bentley himself was considered to be a tool of the Government, a spy upon the diggers, and a secret and influential friend of one Dewes, the most detested of Hotham's magistrates, and we can understand that a very faint puff would be sufficient to cause the smouldering public indignation to blaze into a right fierce flame, sufficient to consume Bentley and his house.

One morning a digger, named Scobie, was found murdered in front of the hotel. Bentley was arrested, brought before a bench of magistrates and acquitted. His defence was that Scobie had been trying to force admission. Public excitement rose high. An indignation meeting was held on the spot where Scobie met his death. A vast crowd assembled. One Kennedy, a compatriot of the dead man, addressed the multitude. "The spirit of the murdered man is hovering above, calling for revenge!" he cried. The authorities had set a guard of police over the building, but the attitude of the crowd was so threatening that it was judged prudent to get Bentley under better protection. Mounted on a fleet horse he dashed out for the camp and reached it in safety. The sight of the flying fugitive roused the men at the Gravel Pits, and by three o'clock there were not less than 9000 men around the tavern. Cries of "Down with the place! Down with it," were heard. A boy flung a stone at the lamp in front of the building and broke the glass. This was the signal for a general shower of stones, and some of the troopers were hit. Then arose the ominous cry "Burn the house! Burn it!" A man carried an armful of paper and rags to the windward side of the bowling alley, and placing them under the calico covering deliberately fired the mass. The building burned like a match-box. As the troops—roused by the arrival of the terrified Bentley—entered Specimen Gully, the flames burst outwards and upwards, resembling, so says an eye witness, a great crest of fire. The beams fell in amid the cheers of the mob, and the soldiers arrived only to find the place they were sent to save a smoking ruin.

Three men—Fletcher, Westerby, and M'Intyre—were arrested for the outrage, and sent under guard to the camp. As often happens on such occasions, the three were believed innocent. It was confidently said that M'Intyre had done his best to prevent the crowd from proceeding to violence, and that Fletcher had not been at the Eureka at all. A meeting of miners was held, and it was resolved to offer bail for the prisoners. A mob of excited men accompanied the bondsmen, and the camp was surrounded with a multitude so threatening in mien that the troops were bid hold themselves in readiness to repel attacks. Luckily the offer of bail was accepted, and the three men liberated amid the cheers of the mob.

The account of the riot was received in Melbourne with alarm. A commission was appointed; but Dewes, the police magistrate, being on it, the diggers declared themselves distrustful of results. One of the many meetings was rendered notable by the increased boldness of the language used by those addressing the assembled crowds. Nothing less than the release of the prisoners, the abolition of license fees, and the establishment of manhood suffrage was now demanded. The prisoners, notwithstanding, were tried in Melbourne and sentenced—M'Intyre to three, Fletcher to four, and Westerby to six months' imprisonment. In the mean time Bentley was tried for Scobie's murder, and put to hard labour on the roads. The commission recommended that certain of the sufferers by the burning of the Eureka should be recompensed, and the Colonial Secretary, Mr.

Foster, dismissed Dewes. The leaders of the popular cause, however, were not satisfied.

There were at this time in Ballarat five men who, in any condition of life, would have made themselves conspicuous, and who in the stormy times of the gold-fields, became remarkable. These were Lalor, Vern, Rafaello, Humffray, and M'Gill—an Irishman, a Hanoverian, an Italian, a Welshman, and an American. Peter Lalor was a native of Queen's County, and a son of the late member for that place. At the time of the out-break he was in the prime of life, and is described by the historian of Ballarat—Mr. Withers—as "six feet in stature, broad-chested, and generally well proportioned . . . . just the man to embody the physical force of the movement." Frederick Vern was a vain and talkative person, with a warm heart, an imaginative brain, and a passion for melodramatic heroics Carboni Rafaello was the novelist's ideal of an Italian conspirator. Forty years old, under the middle height, having red hair and hazel eyes; he wrote, harangued, jeered and wept by turns. An exile from his native country, by reason of his political opinions, he imported into the discussions of the "Committee" a fierce and scornful enthusiasm. Humffray was a handsome, solid Welshman; a good speaker, and an advocate rather for legal redress of wrongs than for impulsive self-assertion. M'Gill was the youngest of the party, and seems to have been carried away by the influence of his companions. Behind the five stood the sturdy and trusted ambassadors of the league, George Black, the editor of the *Diggers' Advocate*, and Thomas Kennedy, of whom Rafaello thus writes: "A thick head, bold but bald, the consequence perhaps not of his dissipation, but of his worry in bygone days."

With these materials, the Diggers of Ballarat were about to create a Revolution. But as yet it had not come to fighting. Expiring prudence suggested that Humffray, Kennedy and Black should go as delegates to the Governor and demand the release of the prisoners. They waited upon His Excellency on the 27th November, and their demand was refused.

(To be continued.)

THE POLITICAL FUTURE OF EUROPE.

THE title placed at the head of this paper is one which will doubtless produce in the minds of most readers a conviction that nothing substantial or satisfactory is to be expected from what will follow. And it must be confessed that such a feeling is usually justified by the utterances of political prophets. Nothing can be more delusive and unsatisfactory than the attempts to look forward into the future so frequently made by those who are most inadequately acquainted with the events of the past. There is no need to remind the readers of this *Review* that the only sound basis for historical prevision, is a careful and complete scrutiny of all past history.

The works of Comte, and the writers of his school, have established this fact beyond the possibility of cavil; and henceforth no one will have the smallest chance of being listened to by the more advanced thinkers on history and politics, who professes to put forward an interpretation of the future, that is not at every step justified by a reference to the acknowledged facts of history. One further qualification should be mentioned Not merely must generalisations respecting the future be obtained from a complete examination of the past; but they must also be shown to be in accordance with the nature of man and society as it exists at the present time. Thus it is not sufficient to show that certain tendencies discernible throughout the whole course of European history may be expected, if they continue to produce certain changes in the future. It must be shown that no alteration in human nature or in the structure of society has taken place, such as could counteract those tendencies. Only when this is done can the prediction be considered as established with any reasonable amount of certainty. If, however, these two requisites are sufficiently observed, there seems no reason why an attempt should not be made to discover what is likely to be the political future of Europe; and more particularly what will be the ultimate result of certain changes which have been going on in the structure of the European state system for many centuries past.

Such an inquiry seems all the more necessary at the present time for several reasons. In the first place, nearly half a century of comparatively small change in the political condition of the Continent—that is, in the distribution of power among the different states—has been followed by a period of very great and very rapid change; and as the next few years will probably be productive of equally great and rapid changes it is obviously important that we should endeavour to ascertain what is likely to be their nature and ultimate bearing. In the second place, the long ascendancy of the Liberal party in England, and the wide prevalence of liberal or democratic views among our literary men, and especially in the periodical literature of the last fifty or sixty years, have given a bias to the views of historical and political thinkers, and thus to a great extent prevented them from contemplating and fairly estimating the probability of certain European changes that would, seemingly at any rate, put an end to some of their most cherished schemes for the reconstruction and improvement of society upon liberal and democratic principles. Thirdly, almost the only really scientific school of historical thinkers at the present day who have attempted to estimate the future of European society—the Comtists—have been consciously or unconsciously biassed by the views of their great founder, and also by the liberal and democratic influences above mentioned.

Now, it is not to be looked upon as at all detracting from our appreciation of the immense services rendered to historical science by Auguste Comte, that he should have altogether misunderstood the real drift and bearing of the political events, both of his own time and of the preceding period. His life extended over an age of comparative quiet and absence of change; and it is not, therefore, much to be wondered at that he thought the era of great political catastrophes was closed with the epoch of the French revolutionary wars; and that Europe had at last settled down into the state which it would maintain, if not permanently, at any rate for a very long time to come. That state he considered was one in which, as formerly, there would be a political balance of the five great nations of Western and Central Europe, and the smaller independent powers that existed beside them; and in which no one nation would either desire or attain such a position of supremacy over the others as to endanger their separate and independent existence. Later on in his life Comte seems to have believed that the larger states of Europe would become considerably subdivided, much as Italy and Germany then were; so far was he from foreseeing the great national movements, which resulted in the unity of these two nations. It is, however, somewhat surprising that Comte's followers, after witnessing the great changes of the last few years, should still hold to those political views of his which are the least sound; and especially to the belief, natural enough in a Frenchman, in the continued supremacy of France in European affairs. As the views about to be put forward in this paper are so entirely opposed, both to those of the Comtists, and also to those of the hitherto prevailing school of liberal and democratic writers in England, it has seemed advisable to point out some reasons for a reconsideration of the whole question; and for making a fresh attempt to infer the political future of Europe, from a careful examination of its past and present, and as far as possible unbiassed by the opinions of any political party. However displeasing the conclusions thus arrived at may be to those who hold certain fixed views as to what *ought* to be the future of European society, it would be most unwise to shrink from facing conclusions as to what probably *will* be that future. It is therefore desirable that political thinkers of every party should bring themselves seriously to consider this question, under the light thrown upon it by history; since the result they may arrive at, whether it be the one here reached or not, can scarcely fail to modify their views, both on this point and on sundry others that are closely connected with it.

After a general survey then of European history for the last thousand years, can we discover any series of changes that have been going on, if not without occasional interruption, at all events without serious reversal, during the whole of that period? Political theorists of different schools have no doubt from time to time professed to discover some such series of progressive changes—the increasing extension of parliamentary government for example; or the supposed irresistible tide of democracy or republicanism; the progressive extension of political power to ever widening classes of the people, which is believed by many thinkers to be one of the principal series of changes discernible during the last five or six hundred years. However probable some of these generalisations may be, they can hardly yet be said to rest upon a sufficiently wide basis of fact. But there seems to be one such generalisation which is not deficient in this respect; inasmuch as it expresses what is indisputably the most conspicuous political phenomenon of the last thousand years, namely, the ever progressing consolidation of political sovereignty; or what amounts to the same thing, the continual diminution of the number of independent centres of government.

This is a great and well-known fact, although its full significance is not generally seen. To put it in another way, we may say that about fifteen hundred years ago the Roman Empire began to break up; that the process of pulverisation continued for several centuries; and that when the Empire had been ground into the smallest fragments possible, a reverse process commenced. The fragments began to join together again; and went on forming larger and larger aggregates, until at the present day we see that in place of the thousands of small independent or semi-independent states—feudal principalities, cities, towns, and villages, into which Europe was at one time divided,—there are only about fifteen, several of which are of small size, and more or less dependent upon their larger neighbours. The process of consolidation has all along been effected either by some of the small independent States conquering and absorbing others; or by the intermarriage of their dynasties; or, though more rarely, by the voluntary and peaceful union of them into federations.

The facts which support this view of the question are so well known as scarcely to require mentioning. The various kingdoms into which England was divided, more than ten centuries ago, were gradually united under the government of one of them—that of Wessex—and this union was consolidated and made final by the Norman conquest. Wales and Ireland were afterwards conquered by England; and Scotland was joined to the latter by the intermarriage of their dynasties. Thus out of a number of once separate and independent States has been formed the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. Similarly, the country that is now France was formerly divided among a large number of independent or semi-independent feudal sovereignties, which have been gradually, either through conquest or dynastic marriages, absorbed by one of them, the county or duchy of Paris, which thus grew into the kingdom of France, in much the same way as the kingdom of Wessex grew into that of England. The various Spanish kingdoms were similarly joined together, until they were reduced to two, now called Spain and Portugal. Switzerland, Holland, and Belgium were all once divided among a number of small states more or less independent of one another and of the empire. The dominions of the House of Austria have been brought together by conquest and intermarriage. Finally, the last few years have witnessed the creation of the kingdom of Italy and the German empire—the nucleus of the one being the kingdom of Sardinia, or, to go back still further, the duchy of Savoy—and of the other, the kingdom of Prussia, itself a development of the electorate of Brandenburg. It should, however, be borne in mind that the great steps taken by these two nations towards political unity within the last few years are only the final stages of a process which has lasted over several centuries. The seven or eight Italian States whose recent union has formed the kingdom of Italy were five or six hundred years ago subdivided among innumerable independent cities and towns; and the process of aggregation, after going on for some time, and giving rise to such considerable States as the duchies of Milan, Tuscany, Savoy, Venice, the Papal state, &c., may be said to have ceased for a long period, and was only quite lately resumed on a still larger scale and with greater rapidity. Similarly with Germany, which from the time of its greatest disintegration has been gradually getting its fragments joined together—the chief centre of attraction having been Brandenburg or Prussia. The wars of the French Republic and Empire early in the present century did much towards joining together the scattered fragments of Germany; no less than three hundred independent sovereignties, principally free cities and bishoprics, being then abolished, and their territories united to other centres.

These well-known facts have been mentioned for the purpose of showing how universal has been the process of consolidation and concentration of sovereignty throughout the whole period of mediæval and modern history. Every country in Europe has passed through the process; and every successive century has witnessed it in one country or another. And it should here be remarked—before we endeavour to ascertain the final drift and direction of this universal movement—that it has been none the less universal and ever progressive, because there have been considerable periods of quiet; and because different countries have been subjected to its influence at different times, and not all contemporaneously—a fact for which special reasons can easily be given in each particular case, but which it is needless here to enter upon, as it in no way affects the general principle. Looking then at this, undoubtedly the greatest political phenomenon of the last ten centuries, the question immediately arises—has the movement we have described reached its natural limits? or may it be expected to continue, until all the existing European states are reduced to one—or at the utmost two or three? The answer that will be supported in this paper is the latter—namely, that the process of political consolidation cannot with any probability be supposed to have ceased; but on the other hand, may reasonably be expected to continue, at least until all Western and Central Europe—excluding from consideration for the present, England and Russia proper—are united under one government, and thus the transition period, which was ushered in by the break up of the Roman dominion, is brought to a close by a reunion of the long severed fragments. Such a conclusion as this will doubtless be startling to the majority of readers; and to those whose minds are unaccustomed to dwell upon the great changes and revolutions of history, and who therefore think that the present state of affairs in Europe may be maintained indefinitely, it will appear absurd and impossible. On the other hand, historical thinkers will be prepared to consider and weigh carefully the reasons that may be given in support of such a conclusion; and all the more readily since the great changes of the last ten years will have disposed them to expect still greater in a not very far distant future.

To begin with, then, it may be asked of those who dispute the position here laid down—why should a process which has undeniably been going on for a thousand years past be supposed to have reached its limits; when there still remains room for its continued action? Why should the distribution of political power among fifteen independent states be more likely to be final than that among several hundred—as it was a century or two back—or among several thousand—as it was at a still more distant period? Why should a process of consolidation which has reduced the states of Europe from thousands to hundreds, from hundreds to fifty, and then again from fifty to fifteen, stop at fifteen and continue no further? There was a time when it would have seemed as unlikely that Scotland, or Poland, or Hungary, or Venice would lose their independence and be absorbed by neighbouring states as it now seems that France, or Austria, or Holland, or Denmark will undergo the same fate. Looking at the question simply in the light of the past, the presumption certainly is that the process will continue until the theoretical limit is reached, and the whole of Europe is united under one government. This would certainly be the conclusion suggested by the last ten centuries of European history; and it remains to be seen whether such a view is supported by a more particular consideration of the tendencies of the present time, and of the wants and necessities of the various independent States and populations of Europe. The question then is—are there causes now at work similar to those that have in times past produced the various local consolidations of government that constitute the existing European powers?

One of the principal causes hitherto has been the great inequality of strength among the various states; and, consequent upon this, the fact, that when one of them has become stronger than any of the others taken singly, there has been an almost certain tendency for that one to encroach upon its neighbours, and thus gradually become a match for almost all of them put together. Of course the particular point in which the superior strength has consisted has differed very much in different cases. In one case it may have been superiority of geographical position, a primary cause of strength in a state; in another, greater stability of government; in a third, a larger number of inhabitants, or mental and moral superiority in the bulk of the people. But in every case it will be found that the states which have become predominant in their different localities have had some germ of advantage over the others, which has led to their gradually conquering and absorbing them. Wessex in England, Paris in France, Castile in Spain, Austria and Prussia in Germany, Savoy in Italy, are all examples of states which, owing to some initial advantage, have gained the upper hand over their neighbours, and have at last swallowed them up altogether. Now Europe as a whole, at the present time, shows on a larger scale the same features that existed centuries ago in its various parts. There are a number of states, of very different degrees of size and strength, the smaller of which owe their independent existence to the mutual jealousies of their two or three larger neighbours; and if, therefore, as we shall endeavour to show further on, one of these latter has already gained over the others a very great advantage in all the elements of national strength, we may confidently expect it to pursue the old course, and finally absorb them all.

So far, then, the parallel holds good. But there is another and perhaps deeper reason yet to be given for expecting it to hold good even to the extent already indicated. The time when the feudal system was at its height was, as every one knows, a period of incessant warfare. In spite of all attempts on the part of the highest feudal sovereigns—such as the Emperors and the French Kings—to check it, the right of waging war against one another was pertinaciously maintained by all but the very smallest feudal princes; and the possession of this right, in fact, constituted their independence. It was the same among the cities of Northern and Central Italy, which were incessantly fighting with one another, until they all became united into a few comparatively large states, mostly monarchies, when a check was put to a state of things, which was undoubtedly, while it lasted, the chief hindrance to any considerable extension of wealth, knowledge and social improvement. It was not, in fact, until large political aggregates had been formed throughout Europe, that any rapid and progressive advance in civilization was made; and if we compare century with century for the last five or six hundred years, we cannot fail to see that each period has produced a great improvement in the state of society, such improvement coinciding with a diminution of warfare—which in its turn has been parallel to the consolidation or concentration of political sovereignty. This process, then, has had all along a real and deep-seated reason for its constant and irreversible operation, namely, the true interest and welfare of the European peoples.

The question then arises—is there any similar reason at the present time why the nations of the continent should welcome a universal dominion, which would put an end to all the separate and independent governments now existing? We believe there is such a reason; one which will grow stronger and stronger every year, and which perhaps, more than any other, will everywhere prepare the popular mind for such a dominion. This is the increasingly oppressive nature of the present military systems of Europe. The principle, first made use of in modern times by Prussia, and through her influence now extended to all Germany—of the liability of every able-bodied man to be a soldier, is being gradually adopted, as a necessary measure of self-defence by the other continental states. Nor is this liability of every man to be called on to fight, and consequently to undergo the training requisite to make him a fighting man, merely theoretical. On the contrary, it is becoming year by year more of a stern reality; as we see by the fact that the Germans have since the last war been successively bringing the various branches of the reserve more thoroughly under the control of the Government, thereby rendering them more efficient as an instrument of war. We may thus expect in a few years' time, to see established in Europe a system under which the whole male population will have been more or less trained for war, and will be liable to be called forth and made use of should a war break out. The intolerable burden to the people of such a system, and the immense hindrance it puts in the way of general industry and social improvement, to say nothing of the constant apprehension under which the whole of society must labour, requires no pointing out; and it remains for us to ask is there no means by which the various continental states can free themselves from such an incubus—or are they doomed for ever to stagger along with this burden upon their shoulders? Some enthusiasts appear to believe that the system will be gradually discontinued as the peoples become more and more sensible of its oppressiveness. But this view will scarcely commend itself to those who hold that every great social change must have an adequate cause, and who see that the oppressive nature of the burden seems to be no hindrance to its present maintenance and even continued extension.

It must, in fact, be plain to everyone who considers carefully the nature of man and society, that nothing short of the concentration of all the existing independent governments into one can permanently put a stop to national quarrels and warfare. The history of the past shows conclusively that before the establishment of the Roman dominion the ancient world was in a state of constant strife and turmoil; that during the existence of that dominion, peace was maintained over its whole extent; and that, when that dominion broke up, the strife and turmoil recommenced, and have continued ever since—growing less and less, however, as Europe has consolidated; that is, as the number of independent states has diminished. The analogy between an aggregate of nations and one of individuals certainly holds good in this case; and as nothing but the establishment of a government omnipotent over all the members of the society has been able to put a stop to private warfare, so nothing but the establishment of a government supreme over all the at present independent states can prevent war from breaking out among them from time to time. There seems to be no escape from this conclusion, and the only point on which there is room for a difference of opinion is as to the nature of this central government—whether it is to be a voluntary confederation of states, or a dominion based mainly upon conquest. There can be no doubt that a confederation of states would achieve the desired end of putting a stop to war, and therefore of diminishing the burden of the existing military establishments—as it would place the whole power of government in one centre. But a consideration of the present condition of Europe will compel us reluctantly to abandon any hope that this great question will be solved in such a manner. The people of Europe are certainly not yet awake to the necessity of such a change; and it is to be feared that before they are, the matter will have been decided otherwise. In fact, we may say that England is now the only power that could take the initiative in such a scheme with any prospect of success, and England has of late shown a disposition more and more decided to allow the affairs of continental Europe to take their own course.

If this view be admitted, we are compelled to abandon the hope that the various European states will voluntarily coalesce into a confederation in order to preserve any degree of internal freedom; and there is no alternative but to believe that they must all sooner or later yield their independence to the strongest of their number. The great and all-important question—one which concerns the fate of European civilization for an indefinite period of the future—then is, which is the nation that is to triumph over all the others, and play the part in modern times that was of old played by the great Roman republic and empire? We believe that all the signs point to Germany—that is, the German empire—as the power upon whom will fall this great task of shaping and controlling the future destinies of Europe; and the following are the principal reasons which seem to lead with an almost irresistible certainty to this conclusion.

In the first place, from a military point of view Germany occupies the most favourable geographical position of all the European powers. Situated in the central part of the continent, and surrounded by states both great and small, she is able in case of a war, even with all her neighbours, to choose her own point of attack, and overwhelm one of her enemies before the others can come to its assistance. This was a chief source of Frederick the Great's strength; and how wonderfully he turned it to account is well known. But the present German Empire possesses this advantage in perhaps a still higher degree. Of the seven states which surround her territory, four—Holland, Belgium, Denmark, and Switzerland—are too small and weak to offer a resistance worth naming, and would be overrun and conquered before any of the three larger powers—Austria, France and Russia—could do anything to help them. The geographical position of Germany, in short, is such that it is able to encroach upon all its neighbours; and it has more neighbours to encroach upon than any other European power. By this means has been achieved from the earliest times the progressive enlargement of Prussia—the germ of the present empire. It has grown at the expense of an ever widening circle of neighbouring states; and within the last ten years we have seen it appropriate territory from Denmark and France, besides swallowing up altogether a number of independent German principalities. The German Empire then, has, by virtue of its position alone, a source of strength that no other European state possesses, or possesses to anything like the same extent.

The second element in its favour is derived from the number and density of its population. In actual numbers alone—about forty-two millions—Germany ranks second only to Russia among all the continental powers; and it increases in this respect faster than any of them. All other things being equal then, the new empire must continue to remain more than a match for any of its neighbours, except Russia. But compared with Russia, it has in the greater density of its population an advantage which, under their present military systems, it is difficult to exaggerate. If we suppose all the adult males of both empires to be trained and organised for war, and to be equal in every military qualification, then the degree of rapidity with which the two armies can be collected, concentrated, and directed against a given point of the enemy's territory, is a question of the utmost importance. When we consider that the Russian army has to be collected from an area many times the size of Germany, to say nothing of the different degrees in which the two countries are traversed by railways, it is not too much to assert that, notwithstanding the Russian superiority in point of numbers, this difference alone would give Germany, in case of war between the two countries, an initial advantage that would be absolutely decisive of the whole contest. In former times, when means of transit for armies were very imperfect, extent of territory and sparseness of population were points in favor of the nation possessing them. But this is now completely reversed, since, owing to the vast change consequent upon the introduction of railways, the result of a war depends more upon the rapidity with which a great army can be mobilised and hurled against a weaker part of the enemy's forces than on any other single point of advantage. In this respect the conditions of warfare have been so completely changed that all the superiority is on the side of a state possessed of a compact and densely peopled territory; and this superiority Germany has over every other on the continent.

A third and no less important source of strength consists in the character of the population; and it is hardly necessary to dwell upon the superiority of the Germans in this respect. To make a great and successful people, two main qualifications are needed—energy and intelligence. As regards the first of these, we have heard a good deal lately about the way in which the Germans are pushing themselves into the trade of the world; and the energy with which their emigrants throw themselves into the work of colonising new and unpeopled territory is well known. Scarcely less conspicuous is the manner in which they have made their way into the eastern parts of Europe, and have succeeded in monopolising the trade of those countries. at the expense of the Sclavonic and other native inhabitants. In fact, this phenomenon may be looked upon as simply a continuation of that eastward extension of the German people which has gone on unceasingly since the time of Charlemagne, and which in a thousand years has so greatly increased the area occupied by their nationality. A similar encroachment, though on a smaller scale, seems to be going on beyond the border line which separates the High Germans from their Low brethren of Denmark and Holland, rather through the superior energy of the former than through their higher educational advantages. As regards education and general intelligence, it will hardly be disputed that the Germans, taken in the mass, and especially those portions of them that are Protestant, stand first among the peoples of the Continent; both over the Latin and Catholic nations of the South, and still more over the Sclaves and Magyars of the east and south-east of Europe. One result, probably, of this double superiority on the part of the Germans, and of their consequently aggressive attitude towards the surrounding populations, is the dislike which they incur from their neighbours, who are being continually supplanted by them in all the higher and more lucrative employments. But these qualities are undoubtedly the prerogatives of an encroaching and predominant race.

A fourth source of advantage, and one perhaps even more conspicuous than those yet mentioned, possessed by the Germans of the Empire over the other nations of Europe, is the great strength and stability of their government. Their superiority in this respect over France, given up to alternations of anarchy and military despotism, and Austria, distracted and paralysed by the conflicting claims of rival races—to say nothing of the fatal division that exists between the Liberals and the Ultramontanes in both these countries—is too manifest to need enlarging upon. The only power whose pretensions to equality on this head are likely to be brought forward is Russia. Here we certainly find a long-established government, acting with despotic power, and seemingly with the unanimous consent and approval of the whole

Russian speaking people. It can hardly, however, be contended that the Russian government rests upon as broad and firm a basis as that of Germany.

As a rule, the more civilized a people becomes, the more widely extended is the support upon which its government rests; and the less does its welfare depend upon the particular ability of any given body of persons who direct its affairs. Thus the prosperity of England and, though perhaps in a somewhat smaller degree, that of the German Empire, by no means depends upon the ability of the reigning sovereign, or of his present advisers; but will continue much the same under their successors.

The truth of this, though it will be generally admitted with regard to England, may possibly be disputed so far as Germany is concerned. But, though no doubt the fact of the very recent creation of its present political structure—which both in its conception and execution is mainly the work of one or two men—renders it highly desirable that it should remain under the guidance of its founders for as long as possible, there can be no reason to doubt that it is now sufficiently established to continue its career of prosperity and advancing greatness under their successors. In fact the system of government both in England and Germany, as well as in every civilized state that has lasted for any length of time, is one that possesses the power of reproducing itself; and the longer it lasts the more certainly can it reckon upon doing so, and the less therefore does its welfare depend upon the life of any one highly-gifted individual, whether sovereign or minister. A nation like Russia, however, which is as yet only very partially civilized, does not contain a sufficiently large class of educated men from which to draw its higher civil and military officials—while, what is probably of still more importance, it has no class corresponding to the aristocracy of Germany and England. It should also be borne in mind that an important cause of Russian success during the last century and a half has been the employment of its German subjects; who have always furnished a large, and unquestionably the ablest portion of its official class both civil and military. Should Russia, however, through any catastrophe lose its German provinces, we might expect to see a very serious falling off in its standard of governing ability, and even a temporary lapse from its present level of civilization. In comparing the relative strength of Germany and Russia it is too often overlooked that the former country is far more thoroughly civilized, and that consequently its army would be much better officered, and its civil administration carried on both with greater ability and with much less corruption than the latter. Germany thus has the advantage of having a government stronger, and resting upon a firmer basis than any other in Continental Europe. Lastly she has a military system unquestionably more efficient than any now existing; its superiority has been tested against two of the great neighbouring powers; and there can be no doubt that it would equally well stand the test against the third. This is so generally admitted that there is no need of any formal attempt to prove it.

We have, then, enumerated five distinct sources of superiority which the German Empire possesses over all its European rivals; namely, its geographical position, the number and density of its population, the energy and intelligence of its people, the strength and stability of its government, and the efficiency of its military system—any one of which would give it the advantage in a contest with any one of its greater neighbours; and the combination of all of which will, we believe, render it more than a match for all taken together. Should his last statement, however, be disputed, and it be said that a coalition of the European powers will prevent Germany from ever becoming their master, it is necessary to point out some reasons why such a coalition is in the highest degree unlikely to take place. We shall not go so far as to say that a union of all the European states including England, if they acted together with the serious determination of checking the aggressive career of Germany, would not be strong enough to do so. Even then, however, the task would be difficult enough, and if it stopped short of completely breaking up the empire, its success might be only temporary. But we think it may be shown that there is not the smallest probability of such a coalition ever being formed, and that it would be a great mistake to suppose that in the event of a serious combination against Germany, the latter would be without allies.

It will doubtless be said that on every occasion hitherto, when the independence of Europe has been threatened by one too powerful state, the others have combined to restrain its encroachments, and have succeeded in so doing. To this it can be answered that on such occasions there has always been the utmost difficulty in forming and keeping together a coalition, even when not merely the political independence but also the national religion has been threatened, as was the case in the sixteenth century, in the conflict between the Protestant states of Europe and the Spanish Monarchy.

Does any one believe that Holland would now oppose incorporation by the German Empire as desperately as she resisted to the death subjugation by Spain?—when her people were fighting, not merely for independence, but for that which they valued more than life itself, the right to maintain their own religion? Yet, even then, great as was the danger to the Protestant states, there was nothing that could be called a coalition. Holland and England were left alone to fight out their battles with the Spanish colossus. To come to the next case in which the independence of the Continent was threatened by one great power—France, under Louis the Fourteenth—how great were the difficulties William of Orange experienced in creating and keeping together a coalition, owing to the jealousies and dissensions of its various members. And yet conquest by Louis the Fourteenth would have involved far more complete subjugation and loss of internal freedom than would incorporation by the German Empire of the present day—the difference being that which separates the provinces of an absolute and highly-centralised monarchy from the members of a comparatively loose and elastic confederation. On the third and last occasion when European independence was threatened by a universal aggressor—France under the first Napoleon—a similar danger was only averted after a long conflict, and mainly through the great blundering and short-sighted policy of Napoleon himself. What should, moreover, be specially noticed is, that in all these cases, although the danger to the independent states of Europe was much greater than that with which they are now threatened by the towering might of Germany, the difficulty of creating and maintaining a coalition for any length of time was found almost insuperable; and the attempts to subjugate Europe failed rather through the errors of the aggressor than from unity of resistance on the part of the powers threatened. The inference, however, to be drawn is, not that Germany will commit like errors, but rather that the European states will not consider themselves sufficiently endangered to make any great and combined effort at resistance.

It may here be noted that the singularly loose structure of the German Empire, allowing, as it does, various degrees of local independence to countries admitted into its body, gives it a great advantage for aggressive purposes over such highly-centralised states as Spain and France, whose vanquished opponents could hope for nothing better than to become enslaved provinces, without a spark of local and internal freedom. In this respect Germany is, perhaps, even superior to the Roman republic of old, whose dominion was that of a municipal aristocracy of the rigid and inflexible character that has always marked such bodies. Another important difference between Germany on the one hand and Spain and France in their most aggressive periods on the other, is that these two powers allowed it to be openly known that they aimed at conquest and increased dominion on all sides—thereby arousing distrust and opposition in the neighbouring States, and thus paving the way for a coalition of the powers that were threatened as the only means of self-protection and preservation. On the other hand, the present German government, with far sounder policy, instead of openly proclaiming its aggressive designs, is continually denying that it has any intention of further aggrandisement, and the consequence is that the vast majority of people, both in England and on the Continent, who have a marvellous facility for accepting as gospel truth the statements of Ministers and diplomatists, are quite unsuspecting, and have not the slightest idea of the vast revolution which is impending over them. This renders it almost certain that Germany will be allowed to attain its purposes step by step, until it becomes too powerful for any coalition to overthrow.

It will, for example, scarcely be disputed that the German provinces of Austria must before very long be joined to the Empire. It is impossible to believe that they can permanently remain under a different government from the great bulk of their own nationality. The strength of the German national feeling in the two empires altogether forbids such a supposition. But the annexation of the German provinces would inevitably involve that of the whole Austrian Empire, except the kingdom of Hungary—namely, Bohemia, Moravia, Croatia, Dalmatia, &c., as no arrangement seems possible by which these countries could escape following the fortunes of Vienna and the purely German territory. Even the Kingdom of Hungary would probably before long become a dependent ally of the German Empire, as the only alternative to being thrown into the arms of Russia.

Again, the German cantons of Switzerland would most likely be induced to join an empire that now included the whole of the purely German population of Europe; and their adhesion would decide that of the Romance cantons. The hostility of Italy could be disarmed by allowing it to annex the Italian cantons of Switzerland and the Italian Tyrol—to say nothing of the ultimate prospect of its regaining Savoy and Nice, and possibly Corsica. And there is no reason to suppose that England would think it worth while to interfere even to save Austria from total destruction—much less to prevent Switzerland from peaceably deciding for itself its own future destiny. Thus two of the greatest steps towards a European dominion would be made by the German Empire, without any probability of a coalition being formed to prevent it. France and Russia might interfere, though it is very problematical whether they would decide to do so, until these changes were already accomplished; and they would then be certainly unable to contend, with the smallest prospect of success, against a power such as the present German Empire, enlarged by the addition of Austria and Switzerland, and probably in alliance with Hungary and Italy. Such a power would in fact be virtually master of Europe. France could only oppose it at the risk of utter ruin to herself, while Russia, if defeated, would certainly lose, not merely her semi-German Baltic provinces, but also Finland, which might be given back to Sweden, as the price either of her alliance or neutrality—and Poland, which Germany might think it worth while to set up as a kingdom depending upon her for support, and forming a permanent barrier between herself and Russia—now restricted to its own proper territory.

The above is of course a merely conjectural sketch of the future steps that are likely to be taken by Germany. The order of events may turn out differently; but it will serve to show how completely she is master of the situation, and how by a careful policy, such as may fully be expected from the great ability of the Berlin Government, she can make herself as completely master of Europe as ever Rome was of the Mediterranean world.

We have in the foregoing account once or twice spoken of the aggressive designs of Germany, and of the German Government. But it is not meant by this that either the people or their leaders have any deliberately formed intention of subverting the independent state system of Europe. We do not believe that the people of Germany, if they thought their government had any such end in view, would give their consent to it. Their desires probably extend no further than including all German-speaking countries under one government, and thereby rendering them strong enough to hold their own against any combination that may be formed with a view to destroy their hard-won unity. But the peculiarity and critical nature of the position lies in the fact that when once this object is attained Germany will be too strong; the European equilibrium will have been overthrown; and the force of events will sooner or later drive her into a collision with France and Russia, the only two continental powers that still retain any considerable degree of strength and independence, and whose traditional policy and national aspirations are and must be in direct opposition to those of the newly-created empire. With one power and one alone, may we expect the latter to act in a decidedly aggressive and uncompromising manner. That power is Austria, whose continued existence is incompatible with the completion and maintenance of German unity. But Austria once overthrown, it is highly probable that the minor states, such as Switzerland, Denmark, Holland and Belgium, will be induced sooner or later peaceably to join the empire. They have everything to gain and nothing to lose by such a step; and should they decide to take it, England will have no pretext for interfering. Only in case of an attack from France and Russia, singly or combined, need we expect to see any still further extension of the empire's boundaries. Should such an attack be made, it is difficult to avoid the conviction that it will utterly fail, and that the offending powers will be so dealt with as to prevent them from ever renewing the attempt again. It is too much to expect that Germany will allow her peace and prosperity to be permanently endangered by these two hostile powers on her extreme frontiers. And with Russia the remedy would obviously be to deprive her altogether of her non-Russian provinces, thus driving her entirely away from the Baltic, and compelling her for the future to restrict her aggressive career to Asia, where alone it can be really beneficial to the general interests of mankind. Should France ever again engage in a contest with Germany, and be thoroughly defeated, she can hope for no other result for herself than complete and utter subjugation—not perhaps all at once, but if by successive steps, none the less certainly, and without hope of reverse.

Before concluding this paper, there is one reason yet to be given for expecting that Germany will succeed in an enterprise in achieving which both France and Spain have previously failed. The new empire, in continuance of what has been for centuries past the traditional policy of Prussia, has placed herself at the head of the fast advancing movement of modern European thought, and is even now carrying on a mortal combat against the leaders of the retrograde system. The consequence is that the whole liberal and anti-Papal party throughout Europe is gradually ranging itself on her side, and the longer the struggle lasts the larger amount of support will she have in any contest she may be forced to enter upon with the representatives of the opposing system. In this respect she differs widely from both France and Spain—which, when they tried to enforce their supremacy upon Europe, were respectively at the head of the Papal and absolutist party throughout Europe, and whose triumph would have been the triumph of the Church and absolute monarchy, and the ruin alike of material progress and intellectual enlightenment. This is, perhaps, the cause of a wider difference in Germany's chances of success as compared with theirs than any that has yet been mentioned. At least, it will seem so to all who believe in the ultimate victory of science and good government over bigotry and clerical reaction. The strife between the two systems which broke out openly three centuries ago with the Reformation is now being renewed, and will shortly be conducted to its final issue. The Ultramontane party is mustering its forces on the one side, and its hopes are placed on France and Spain and Austria, with Russia looming in the background as an ultimate ally; while Germany alone on the other side represents the liberal and progressive party of Europe. This view of the case gives the contest an importance to the future of civilization, greater than belongs to any mere political struggle; but none the less does it affect our estimate of the probability there is of Germany ultimately uniting the fragmentary governments into which the Roman Empire was broken more than a thousand years ago. The aim of this paper has been to show that a process of reunion among the fragments has been going on ever since; that it has now nearly reached its completion; and that the new German Empire is the centre round which the still separate portions will aggregate; impelled as she is to that great and important position by a number of distinct causes which have been enumerated; any one of which by itself might be considered insufficient, but the whole of which taken together seem to render her success certain and irresistible.

THE DRAMA AS A FINE ART.

It is a well-known fact that among savages there are many individuals who possess great mimetic ability. Among the aborigines of this country, for instance, we meet with mimics whose performances display not only nice observation, but also a keen sense of humour. Mimicry and expressive gesture are in fact part of the language of uncivilised man, which he must frequently use to supplement his rude and scanty vocabulary, more especially in the expression of his passions and emotions, which greatly predominate over his intellectual nature.

The source of the dramatic art cannot, however, be traced to the utility of mimicry for purposes of expression, or we should find it in the most flourishing state wherever that utility is the most urgently felt, that is among savages; which is very far from being the case.

Fine Art is ornamental, not directly and vulgarly useful. It may be compared to the Bath footman in Pickwick, who would have expired rather than have consented to do any menial work. Art is the product of civilization; for as long as the struggle for existence absorbed the whole of man's activities—in other words, as long as he remained uncivilized—neither Art nor the footman could possibly exist.

What then is the origin and function of the dramatic art, or rather of those æsthetic sentiments from which all art has originated?

Mr. Herbert Spencer, in his Principles of Psychology, traces the æsthetic sentiments to what he terms the play-impulse. This play-impulse arises from the desire to exercise activities no longer adequately exercised in the struggle for existence. Thus a domestic cat who has no need to earn her living by the use of her claws, will nevertheless exercise her predatory instincts in mere play. She will often perform a kind of dramatic game of cat and mouse, in which any small rolling object may represent the mouse. One finds, too, by playing with her that she is quite a realistic artist, who may in her emotional ardour use her talons with a painful fidelity to nature not unworthy of Salvini.

Man, too, must exercise his unused activities. If his physical activities be not adequately exercised in work, he will exercise them in play. Thus the members of our cricket, rowing, and polo clubs do not, as a rule, earn a living by physical labour, and therefore they delight in physical exercise. Similarly, if a man's emotional and intellectual activities be not fully exercised in work, the desire to exercise them in play will be felt; and from this form of the play-impulse, according to Mr. Spencer's theory, the æsthetic sentiments and the fine arts have originated.

The old words, play and player,.seem to support this theory as far as the dramatic art is concerned. A drama is, in fact, a vivid representation, in the form of *play*, of the active manifestations of human nature.

Here however we are brought face to face with the great distinction between Art and Nature, between the realm of Imagination and that of Reality. The former is a reflex of the latter, but by no means a faithful copy of it. In fact, as art critics are beginning to see, art consists not in imitating but in idealising Nature. The artist must

> "Add the gleam,
> The light that never was on sea or land,
> The consecration and the poet's dream."

Music, for instance, may be a form of emotional or passionate language, but it is not the mere imitation of inarticulate exclamations of pleasure or pain, joy or grief; nor of the intensified tone, nor the increased range of voice, which emotion may cause. Music is the idealisation of these vocal manifestations of emotion.

The American humourist who despised an opera because the heroine sang an elaborate aria, under circumstances supposed to be heart-rending, exhibited his ignorance of the function of art, and his inability to feel the beauty of idealised expression. It is quite true, as that gentleman observed, we do not in real life sing arias when our friends and relatives die; we express our genuine sorrow much as our savage forefathers did, by lamentations which are thoroughly natural and thoroughly inartistic. But the plaintive music which any composer of true dramatic instinct would introduce in an emotional situation of an opera, will suggest to one of musical sensibility the corresponding emotion, only in so idealised a form as to be highly pleasurable rather than intensely painful.

Similarly whenever the drama has reached the point of art, it has been not only a vivid representation, but an idealised representation of the active manifestations of human nature.

The idealising force which is so essential to all art seems to have been supplied in the antique world mainly by the religious emotions, and this indeed explains why art was originally consecrated to the services of religion. The Greeks, who were a highly religious and a highly artistic people, afford an admirable illustration. The imaginative Greek mind teemed with fanciful allegories, which were woven into the national religion by poet, dramatist and musician, by painter and sculptor. It would be quite beside the present question to attempt any explanation of the religious sentiments, further than may be gathered from the foregoing explanation of the æsthetic sentiments. Certain philosophers however have ventured to assert that religion has been of no service in the gradual evolution of human society. Such philosophers seem wholly to ignore the emotional element in man, and to regard him only as a reasoning machine. This theory of human nature is ludicrously false, and leaves religion and art wholly unexplained phenomena.

Reverting to the Greeks, we learn that the theatre was their great religious institution, and that the tragedies of Æschylus, Sophocles and Euripides formed a portion of their ceremonial worship. These tragedies were represented in immense theatres, capable of holding thirty or forty thousand persons, by actors wearing the mask, and the cothurnus, who sang, or rather chanted, the divine verses of the dramatist. Conspicuous among the *dramatis personæ* were the national gods and heroes.

That these dramas were idealisations rather than imitations of actual life, may be inferred from their very nature. In fact, to the prosaic modern mind they seem too unlike actual life, too far removed from the region of human sensibilities. We can feel but a faint interest in these mighty abstractions; the joys and sorrows of these supernatural beings are too unlike our own petty joys and sorrows to move us greatly. We do not feel in them, or but faintly, that touch of nature which makes the whole world kin, and which, when idealised into art, so potently affects us. To the Greek of that age, however, these gods and heroes were realities, who were regarded as being closely connected with the national history and the daily life of the people.

The old Greek Comedy of Aristophanes. and the later or new comedy as it was termed of Menander, introduced a more distinctly human element into Greek dramatic literature.

The Romans were an intensely practical and inartistic people. Their dramatic literature was merely a translation of the later Greek Comedy. They never acclimatised the Tragic Muse. To them the life and death struggles of the gladiators and wild beasts in the amphitheatre were a much more exciting performance than a tragic drama in which the actors merely pretended to kill one another. If they could see Nature herself, why should they hold up the dramatic mirror? They had the Real and preferred it to the Ideal. And if, as certain modern critics maintain, the drama be only an imitation of Nature, then the Roman view of the matter is an altogether sensible one. But if art delight us by its idealising power, if it bear the same relation to Nature that a landscape garden does to an uncultivated piece of land, then were the ancient Romans wanting in all artistic sensibility.

The rude, early drama of modern Europe, so unlike the grand tragic drama of ancient Greece, in every other particular resembled it in being purely religious. The old mystery plays were written and acted by ecclesiastics, and were often vivid representations of the pains and penalties of the Christian religion as understood in those unenlightened days. The Deity was introduced upon the stage in the most anthropomorphic manner, and with what seems to us the most striking irreverence, while the devil was usually a very conspicuous and entertaining character. The titles of these mystery plays, such as "The Harrowing of Hell," sufficiently indicate their character, and the plot and dialogue demonstrate the rudeness of the dramatic art of that period. Eventually the drama became wholly divorced from religion, and attained to high artistic and intellectual splendour.

Then arose a feud between the pulpit and the stage, which like most family quarrels was intensely bitter. Religious persons seemed to believe that all emotional representations of a non-religious character were dangerous to the well-being of society and destructive of man's higher nature. This was at least the adumbration of a great truth, for civilisation may be said to consist mainly in the subjection and guidance of emotion by reason. Nor can it be denied that our dramatists have too often been in the habit of appealing to the grosser passions of mankind. They seem in numerous instances to have taken Polonius, of whom Hamlet says "He's for a jig or a tale of bawdry, or he sleeps," as a type of human nature; and it is perhaps worthy of note that Polonius was not only a high official but outwardly a very excellent and courteous old gentleman, capable of giving, if occasion served, much valuable moral advice.

The religious opposition to the stage was however carried on in a thoroughly indiscriminate manner. It was the outcome of that spirit of asceticism which was in a great measure the Christian reaction from Pagan licentiousness. Like all violent reactions, it went too far, and wherever successful proved fatal to science and philosophy as well as to art. It denounced not only the grossly anti-social pleasures, but also the higher social pleasures, and even forbade the exercise of those activities which make human life worth preserving. St. Simeon Stylites, whom Tennyson so dramatically portrays, may be taken as a type of the extreme ascetic character. He gloried in having renounced the pleasures and in having left unfulfilled the duties of social life, and thought he had established a claim to saintship and to *post-mortem* beatitude, for having occupied for years an extremely inconvenient lodging on the top of a tall pillar.

Actuated by this spirit, the Puritans of the time of Cromwell shut the theatres, and made the unfortunate actors unwilling martyrs for their art. That a lingering remnant of this ascetic superstition still exists is shown by the fact that most of the clergy and a section of the laity consider it wicked to attend a theatrical representation, even of Shakspeare's Hamlet or Beethoven's Fidelio. Dramatic literature however has so frequently attained to high artistic excellence that most cultured persons have studied it, even those who, like Milton, have bitterly opposed the immoralities of the stage. In fact until recently the greatest literary artists of Europe have been dramatists. In France, Racine, Corneille and Molière, and the most universal literary genius of the eighteenth century, Voltaire, were all writers for the stage. In Spain we find Calderon and Cervantes; in Italy, Metastasio and Macchiavelli; and in Germany, Goethe and Schiller; while in England perhaps the most interesting part of the literature of the country are the plays of that actor of second-rate characters and part manager and proprietor of the Globe Theatre—William Shakspeare.

It would be clearly futile to attempt any criticism of modern dramatic literature in the narrow limits of a Review article. The commentaries which have been written on the dramas of Shakspeare alone would fill a library, and there is ample material for a long article on any one of his well-known characters. All that can be attempted on the present occasion is to support by modern instances the theory of the dramatic art already set forth.

The drama has been classified as a fine art, and defined as an idealisation rather than an imitation of the active manifestations of human nature. As quite opposed to this, a well-known passage may be quoted. The "purpose of playing," according to Hamlet, "is to hold as 'twere the mirror up to nature, to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time his form and pressure."

Are we to infer from this deliverance that a dramatist must never stray into the realms of fancy; that he must portray simply every-day men and women, and make his characters express themselves in the slip-shod style peculiar to real life? If this be so the drama can have no pretensions to art. But Shakspeare's own dramas show us that he was unacquainted with or ignored such narrow canons of criticism, and followed a quite opposite and much higher method.

The delightful creations in "The Midsummer Night's Dream" are not to be met with in the streets of London or Melbourne; and does not "The Tempest" o'erstep the modesty of nature, according to the interpretation of the phrase by the realistic critics of the present day? We have never seen beings like Puck or Ariel, Caliban or Prospero, Titania or Oberon; and Shakspeare never saw them in the flesh. They are "airy nothings" to which the poet has given "a local habitation and a name." Are they, then, to be forthwith banished from our dramatic literature as violations of nature? It would be a singularly prosaic individual who could consent to any such revolting outrage. Surely they are beautiful idealisations, sufficiently real to be interesting, and formed to delight us by their very contrast with the disagreeable realities of life.

Shakspeare idealises not only in these supernatural creations, but also in his treatment of characters typical of human nature. The Lear or the Othello of real life would not habitually express himself in rhythmical blank verse, nor would the real Hamlet or Macbeth utter deep philosophic truths clothed in sublime language as in the Shakspearian drama.

The inartistic desire to imitate Nature too closely led the French dramatists to study the "unities," according to which a play must extend only over a certain time, and the scenes must follow in a certain natural sequence. Strangely enough, while content to slavishly adhere to the unities, they violated nature by making their characters talk in rhymed verse. The truth is, the artistic dramatist does not attempt to hold the mirror up to nature as it is, but as he thinks it should be.

Even our later playwrights, who rarely attain to art, idealise more perhaps than they are aware of. As some one remarks, the late T. W. Robertson, frequently portrayed the poetical side of common life. Had it not been so, no interest would have been felt in his plays, for we do not want to hear on the boards of a theatre the same conversations that we daily hear at the breakfast table and in the streets. Observe too, the plan and purport—the *moral* as it were—of nearly all modern plays. At the end, virtue is always rewarded, while vice is as persistently punished; the good are made happy, and the wicked are made miserable. But alas! this is very far from being an imitation of reality; it is an idealisation, though in an undoubtedly clumsy manner, of actual life.

> "The world's a stage"—as Shakspeare said one day,
> The stage a world—was what he meant to say;
> The outside world's a blunder, that is clear,
> The real world that Nature meant, is here.

That the artistic view of life is opposed to the scientific spirit of the age cannot be well gainsaid. Science deals exclusively with facts and abhors fancies. The leaders of modern thought resemble the celebrated gentleman who asked after reading Paradise Lost, "What does it all prove?" Even emotion, which has been and is so important a factor of human nature, must henceforth be regarded as a bias to be guarded against in the formation of opinion. But if imagination and emotion are to be treated after this summary fashion, what is to become of the drama? How is a play to be constructed on a solid basis of fact, and without love or hatred, jealousy or pity, anger or sympathy? This at least is certain, the dramatist must adjust himself to the altered conditions of society or suffer himself to be blotted out.

When every gentleman wore a sword, murders and violent deaths were by no means uncommon, and the materials for a stirring drama which would appeal to the sympathies of an audience were never wanting. Now we are a weaponless people, and murder is regarded as a brutal crime chiefly confined to the lowest class of society. It is the same with all the violent passions; they are being brought either under the control of reason or the policeman. The poor playwright is at his wit's end to invent situations which shall interest his audience. He introduces a railway train coming on at full speed. while a man lies asleep on the track, or a house on fire with an unfortunate inmate trying to escape, and although such casualties do actually occur, they fail to interest a cultured modern audience for long, even when represented with the most realistic effects. Is it a fact then that the influence of the drama is on the wane?

We all feel that the stage is no longer a teacher of mankind, and that its sole function, if it have one at all, is to amuse. This along with almost everything else that distinguishes modern from ancient civilization has been caused by the invention of printing. We now go to books for information on nearly every subject, and oral methods of instruction are becoming obsolete. Books devoted to fiction also provide us with amusement, and are a means of exercising the unused activities from which arise the play-impulse. In fact the novel has in many ways superseded the drama. The novelist, especially with the aid of the circulating libraries, enables every man to be as it were his own theatrical manager, and to enjoy his favourite drama by his own fire-side. The novel, too, has many intellectual advantages over the drama; it is certainly much better fitted for purposes of psychological analysis and elaborate character-drawing. There are more typical characters in Dickens' novels, and more psychology in the pages of George Eliot, than in the entire range of English dramatic literature since Shakspeare.

In short, as a medium for the expression of thought rather than emotion, the novel is clearly superior to the drama.

How vastly different were the social conditions anterior to the invention of printing, and to the consequent dissemination of knowledge among the masses. In ancient Athens the theatre was not only an æsthetic institution but also the principal organ for the publication of opinion. This was the case, although to a less extent, with the English theatre of the time of Shakspeare. A very large proportion of men and women "in the spacious times of a great Elizabeth" were blissfully ignorant of the three R.'s, and to such audiences the theatre would provide instruction as well as amusement. The acted drama then contained nearly all the current ethics, philosophy, history, poetry and fiction, and Shakspeare was not only the Dion Boucicault, but also the Macaulay, Tennyson, Dickens and Herbert Spencer of the period.* These functions however are becoming more and more differentiated, and modern society is so highly complex that we can never again have a great national drama, covering the ever-widening range of intellectual and emotional activity.

In this sense the drama has declined. But with the progress of civilization the æsthetic sentiments must increase. Progress surely means among many other things the approximation to a state of society in which the minimum of our activities will be required in the struggle for existence, and in which therefore the unused activities will be proportionately increased and the play-impulse will have a correspondingly wider scope. This tendency is shown by the fact that although our unused activities are exercised in ways hitherto undreamt of, there are more theatres and consequently more actors and play-goers at the present time than at any previous period of the world's history; while the scenery, dresses, music and other stage accessories have reached a pitch of high artistic excellence.

---

* Bacon published in Latin, and his works therefore formed no part of the current philosophy of the people.

It may be safely predicted that our emotional and intellectual pastimes will continue essentially dramatic. They will also become more and more idealised. The time will surely come when an audience will be too refined to witness the horribly inartistic *denouement* of the conventional tragedy. The murder of a woman done before our eyes will some day be regarded as revolting, though the murderer be Othello. "Tragedy," says a modern writer, "went out with the bowl and the dagger;" and assuredly the violent passions and agonising emotions of that form of the drama are inharmonious with the spirit of the age. Here we have an explanation of the increasing neglect and even disfavour with which the so-called legitimate drama is being treated.

It is not contended that our emotional nature will become extinct and that man will in the future be an incarnation of pure reason. Undoubtedly the emotions will be repudiated as a guide in the practical affairs of life, and will be regarded as a bias, which we cannot too carefully guard against in the formation of speculative opinions. But concomitantly with increased intellectual activity there will be increased emotional activity. A very little self-analysis will show us that almost all the pleasures of life arise from the emotions, and have little if anything to do with the intellect. This evolution from lower to higher types, which we call progress, would indeed be an undesirable process if it meant that we were approximating to a social condition in which there would be more wisdom and knowledge, but less pleasure and enjoyment.

With advancing civilization, however, the emotions will be of a less violent and less anti-social nature, and will perform an altogether higher function than heretofore, and to that extent must become more and more unfitted to supply the materials for tragic plays.

What then will be the drama of the future? We can only say that if it exist it must be an idealisation of the human nature of the future which will be of an intrinsically higher type than the human nature of the present or the past.

This prophecy is not unlikely to cause persons of great experience in theatrical matters to smile sardonically. They may point to the present state of the stage, to the popularity of the sensational drama and of opera bouffe, and ask if these be idealisations of a higher type of human nature. Notwithstanding these things, we are sanguine enough to believe there is balm in Gilead.

With regard to the acted drama, sensational or non-sensational, of the present day, we think it is merely a transitory phase in the history of the stage. Let it not be overlooked too that, though these plays often fall short of artistic or literary excellence, their authors exhibit a great amount of talent in adapting their productions to the requirements of the stage, and to the popular demand for amusement, as distinguished from instruction. Nor should we expect to hear psychology or even elaborate word-painting in the theatre of to-day. It may be added that the most sensational of modern plays rarely contain such violent incidents or such overwhelming catastrophes as we find in the old legitimate drama.

It is, however, in the daily increasing appreciation shown by the public for music that we mainly place our hopes. Music is the most idealised form of language known to man. Here there has been undoubtedly great progress, for not only is modern music superior to ancient music, but it seems as though increasing appreciation of it ever accompanies increasing civilization. Here there is no harsh struggle between the emotional and the intellectual nature. The most matter-of-fact philosopher will hardly venture to assert that his intellect can be warped by listening to beautiful harmony and melody. Music, in fact, has this great advantage over all other forms of emotional language: it does not appeal to the intellect at all. Regarded in this light, the rise and progress of modern opera—even of opera-bouffe—is a hopeful sign of the times and it may be predicted that the drama of the future will be musical in form, while retaining its essentially dramatic nature.*

ARTHUR P. MARTIN.

---

* Operatic composers, judging from the selection of their libretti, are often wanting in dramatic instinct. Hamlet and Othello are certainly ill adapted for musical expression, while song might well be the natural speech of the beings in the Midsummer Night's Dream or the Tempest. Mr. Gilbert's three delightful comedies also appear well suited for musical expression.

LABOUR AND CAPITAL.

It has unfortunately become a matter of popular reproach against political economy that its teachings are apparently in some ways irreconcilable with those of morality and justice. It is alleged, for instance, that the law of demand and supply is essentially iniquitous, in producing and establishing an unequal distribution of wealth, and leaving a barely life-supporting margin of profit for the actual producer; thus involving the hopeless perpetuation of poverty in its most painful and aggravated forms, even to the remorseless suppression of the numerical excess and least efficient of the labouring class. The laws of the survival of the fittest and of natural selection are of course equally obnoxious to the same complaint, and for similar reasons. This appeal is generally made to both morality and justice, thereby implying that both are equally contravened, and that both ought to be equally consulted. As not only the value of political economy; but the prosperity and happiness of the human race, depend upon the solution of this question, I propose to enquire into the validity of the charge.

It may be as well to clear the ground a little. Morality and justice are far from synonymous terms, and it is a question how far either countenances the charge made in its name. Morality means those principles of action by which men best promote happiness, or the interest of society, including themselves in so far as useful to society. Justice is held to be favourable to the same objects, but to have a further standard in the title to equal consideration of all individuals in society. Morality is thus directly concerned about the interest of society; indirectly about that of individuals. Justice is directly concerned about the interest of individuals; indirectly about that of society. Now, justice has its basis in law; and laws appear to be abridgements of the freedom of individuals for the benefit of society, while justice maintains the claims of individuals to or against the enforcement of the laws. Morality, of course, recognises the claims of individuals so far as they concur with the advantage of society, but rejects them when incompatible with it. Morality and justice, therefore, both aim at the best to be done by man for the happiness of society. Morality embraces the entire field of possible human action. Justice extends to a part of the details thereof, having been introduced by man for moral purposes, Political economy is also a part of morality, relating to the best means as a means of happiness, in the interest of society, of increasing wealth. The expenditure or distribution of acquired wealth (which is always in the hands of individuals, and not in those of the State, which has no profits or wealth,) is private economy, and outside the province of political economy; though of course included in morality. It has hitherto been accepted that it would not conduce to the happiness or advantage of society to interfere with private economy further than as, by laws, the protection of one individual against any other individual is provided for. "The perfection of government," wrote Mr. Buckle, "is the maximum of security with the minimum of interference." Experience has proved that all attempts to interfere with private economy have, so far as effectual, by lessening security produced results the opposite of those desired.

Now the laws of political economy are not arbitrarily constructed enactments, but laws of an entirely different nature; namely generalisations of facts. They are not attempts to coerce or even direct social operations, but simply to classify and understand the universal conditions to which such operations must necessarily be amenable; and so far from the investigations of political economists leading to legislation calculated to benefit one class at the expense of another, the conclusions at which they have generally arrived have been the opposite, and such as that of Mr. Buckle, that "the best laws which have been passed have been those by which some former laws were repealed"—(Vol. I., p. 275). Until the antecedent conditions were duly discerned and understood, legislation was necessarily blind and tentative. Hence it is not wonderful that it was eventually found to be defective; but having been adopted under the most perfect theory of society obtainable at the time, its amendment should not be expected to precede the development and perhaps completion of a superior theory. Political economy has been hitherto occupied mainly in establishing the inductions upon which the amended theory is to be deductively built; and the theory can scarcely be held to be complete enough to form a basis of legislation, until it shall have been shown to be in harmony with itself, and with other established inductions. Theories of morality and justice are essentially deductive, and must therefore conform to all verified inductions. For true inductions are built upon facts, and deductive theories upon the inductions; and such theories must inevitably undergo modifications whenever those inductions are corrected by experience and observation.

Now if the data of political economy—the laws of the pressure of population, of demand and supply, of natural selection and the survival of the fittest—are simply impregnable inductions from the phenomena of nature and of human society, it would be as reasonable to quarrel with the inherent properties of numbers, as with them. If we in the use of them come to contradictory conclusions and anomalies, it is we that are wrong and not they; and if they conflict with deductive theories of morality and justice, it is only so much the worse for those theories. What we have to do is to study the facts, and learn to turn them to advantage by conforming our action to them. It is hard for us to kick against the pricks. We should remember that society has arisen from the operation of those very laws, and that therefore it is impossible that there can be any real antagonism between them and the state of society which they have produced. The subject is a large one. But as the general principles involved are condensed in the question of the alleged antagonism of labour and capital, their discussion will be advantageously concentrated on that point. I do not deny that there is antagonism. There is antagonism. But it is not between labour and capital, but between the labourer and the capitalist. This is what I deplore, and desire to remove as factitious, unnecessary and disastrous, but arising solely in misconception. The labourer and capitalist thus unfortunately occupy the positions of a man and his wife who are always fighting like dog and cat. That it is incontestable that they do so is no proof of a necessary antagonism in matrimony. It requires no argument to prove that it would certainly be both possible and conducive to the mutual advantage and happiness of such persons, to be amicable and reciprocally helpful. It is their misfortune that they cannot see it. I shall endeavour to show that this is exactly the case with labour and capital.

If there were really any natural antagonism of interest between them, the improvement of society to any great extent would be utterly hopeless, and could not have been so far evolved. The antagonism, if inherent, could never admit of the existence of capital at all. For capital is accumulated results of labour. Nothing else. Thus the antagonism, if any, would be between labour and accumulated labour. If the proceeds of labour were not to accumulate, there would of course be no such things as capital, or accumulated results of labour. But such a state of things is obviously incompatible with any condition of civilization or prosperity; and would be identical with only the lowest state of savagery; that in which the savage, for he cannot be called a labourer, has not yet manufactured arms or dwelling; either of which would be capital.

No objection probably would be raised to the accumulation of the results of labour, provided that the accumulations were to remain in the hands of the labourer himself. Not only, however, does the natural disparity in human capacities and constitutions forbid and prevent it, but the nature of accumulation to an extent to be effective in civilization, or to constitute the accumulator a capitalist is such as to involve that the aggregation of the small savings of the results of the labour of many must inevitably come to the hands of a few only. The first capitalists were doubtless those labourers who were more accumulative than their neighbours. Of those who worked the hardest, many never could save at all; and a few collected the savings of the proceeds of their own labour, and also those of their neighbours' who could never save their own, which would otherwise therefore have been lost to the world. The saving of the hardest worker would—alone—be necessarily too small and worthless for publicly useful purposes. And as for such purposes much larger accumulations are indispensable than the largest possible aggregations of one individual's labour, it is obvious that they can only be accomplished by means of a small number concentrating in their hands the proceeds of the labour of the non-saving large majority. Were all men equally workers and savers, each one of the results of his own labour alone, a high civilization would be impossible; if indeed there could be any emergence from savagery at all. For the results of the labour, like the labour itself, would then be distributed—not accumulated in bulk; and could not produce the benefits solely securable by accumulation. Capitalists are therefore not only indispensable to civilization and progress, but their number must also necessarily be relatively small compared with that of the labourers; and the labourers would never enjoy the benefit from the accumulation of their own labours together with that of others, were it not that a few persons are endowed with the special qualifications of the capitalist.

There can thus assuredly be no capitalist without many labourers, and no accumulation of the results of labour, without a capitalist or accumulator. So far no ground of antagonism appears between them. Let us see how this concurs with morality and justice.

Morality demands such action as best promotes the happiness and prosperity of society. This includes, also, the happiness of the individuals composing society; and, failing that, of the greatest proportion of them. It has no interest in individuals outside society, or in those within society, whose action or presence is inimical to its happiness and prosperity. Labourers and capitalists are both indispensable to a happy and prosperous society; but here intrudes one of the most important of the original conditions of the case. This is the almost *infinite natural disparity* of individuals. This is what determines and fits one to be a labourer, and another a capitalist; many to be neither, a few to be both. Without this disparity, there could be no progress; for without differentiation there could be no improvement—no variation—no society; for society, there is little doubt, began by the combination of the weak to resist the strong. Disparity is therefore moral as well as naturally inevitable. The introduction of equality by negativing these moral conditions, would be immoral; would it be just?

Justice we found is concerned first about the interest of individuals. If nature endows one with great strength, another with wit, would it be *just* to deprive them of the advantages which they inherit or receive from nature? Surely not. Would it be just to the weak, the unapt, the stupid, the sickly, the immoral themselves, to raise them to the level of enjoyment of the most highly favoured? Justice itself would do one no more than the other. And even benevolence could not raise the inferior, but by malevolence to the superior. But there is nothing which human justice more entirely ignores than original disparity. Evil inheritance and education do not exculpate from crime or exempt from its penalties, whether abstract justice would do so or not. But abstract, as well as human justice or law is secondarily interested in society, and decides that the welfare of society, and of the individuals composing it, shall not be sacrificed to the convenience of an inferior individual. It would not be just that a society endowed with a capacity for progressive improvement should be deprived of happiness and prosperity, because an inferior minority cannot share it on equal terms with a superior majority. If the advocate of justice complain of the original disparity, the answer needs not to be limited to the bare statement that it is so, and cannot be altered. Justice would not be satisfied by an alteration or even compensation. It cannot rectify what cannot be undone, even if equality could now be effected. The annihilation of the universe could not undo or compensate for the injustice already perpetrated. Justice is absolutely impracticable, even at the sacrifice of every good; and its advocate should be content with the opportunity of acting for the best with things as we find them. We thus find that morality really certifies the laws of Political Economy, and that justice—so far as possible and rational—endorses them.

But it is said that the labourer is worthy of his hire. Doubtless; whether the hire be determined at a minimum by his own needs, or at a maximum by those of his employer. The *amount* of the hire is the question at issue, and it cannot be determined otherwise than by the law of demand and supply, not only of labour, but also of the article to be produced. That law only can determine whether the future consumption of the article will pay the cost of its production.

It is said that the labourer has a *right* to a fair day's wage. Doubtless; if he can get it, he has a right to the *highest* wage that the law of demand and supply, which alone can determine what is fair, may at any time give him. In fact legislative attempts to control the rate of wages have all proved futile or pernicious. If we regard the meaning of the word "*right*," we find that the adjective "*right*" has an arbitrary signification of what in local conventional opinion *ought to be*, not what is; while the substantive "*right*" means power conferred by human law. The substantive, when applied outside legal privilege, has no meaning beside natural power. I have a natural right to walk and talk, or to forbear, while I have the power to do either; but none to do what I have no natural power to do. I have no right to fly through the air, or to be seven feet high; and to say I have any right—or no right—to be taller or shorter, would be absurd. The word right is inapplicable to any action which I have not the option of doing or forbearing. I cannot properly be said to have a right to be more wise or foolish, virtuous or vicious, tall or short, than I am by nature, for I have no option in the matter; and to say I have any right to be anything which I am not is absurd, because natural right is determined by power, and social right by law. Every one would be far more virtuous, powerful and wise, but for the lack of power. Power then being equivalent to natural right—whether it be "*right*" (this is the adjective) or proper or moral to exercise the power, is a question of wisdom or folly. This concurs with legal "*right*," which—though it be to do or to forbear—it may be either wise or foolish to exert.

Every man has a right to every advantage which does not involve the abridgment of like advantages of others *at the same standard of civilization*. Civilized society forbids the appropriation by one of its members of the property of others; but tolerates the aggrandisement of those who represent—having accumulated—most results of labour or power, preferently to that of those who do not accumulate;

and approves the extermination of the Australian and Maori races by the civilized European. For power is on the side of the supplanter in each case, and power constitutes all that is not factitious in right. This indicates the merely conventional and factitious character of the notion of right without power. Attempts to colonise New Guinea failed simply because power was deemed insufficient. The very British labourer who exclaims at the oppression and injustice of a wealthier class in his own society, scouts the idea of equality between himself and the Australian, the Negro and the Chinese. The idea of "*right*" is simply an invention of civilised society for its *security;* not to protect the members of any class against another, unless so far as it tends to establish the general security by which the wealthy benefit most, though only in appearance. For if the right or power of a wealthy minority generally outweigh that of a large majority, that is because it represents the power or accumulated labour of a still larger number; and thus wealth has its basis in, and derives its power from, the labour of the majority. Government was instituted for the security of property.

It is nevertheless *wise* to strive for good which we have not, provided we do not miscalculate our power to attain to it, so as to realise an evil instead of a good, as we too often do. But even then we gain experience by our failures, and it is therefore often good to strive for what we cannot get; we often thereby attain to other good of which perhaps we had not dreamed. But it should be clear, as possession—or power to possess—only can determine right, that to claim what we want on the ground of abstract right, is nonsense, and a mere substitute for other reasons which we do not care to give, but which generally amount to this, that we think it judicious to make the claim. The difficulty of judging with certainty of what is wise and foolish, good and evil, as objects of activity, is certainly great; but it is not disposed of by claiming what we want on a fictitious ground, till we have actually got it, and so created a practical right based on possession. It is far more straightforward and logical to claim it because we want it, and because we think that—consequences carefully considered—it is wise to endeavour to obtain it and probable that we shall succeed. Power confers natural right, and law social right. I believe that most of our errors in miscalculating our powers and rights in complex social relations arise from misconception induced by the baseless notion that right can subsist without power. We have a right to all we can get, and to try even for what we cannot get; but if we find that we have not the power to get a thing, we should perceive that we have no right to it. The recognition of the true value of this expression—*right*, is a necessary preliminary to the accurate apprehension of the relations of labour and capital; which should be considered upon the basis, not of any hypothesis of fanciful or at least disputable rights, but upon that of the best interest of those concerned. That is—the greatest happiness of the greatest number.

Capital is defined as "that portion of the produce of labour saved from immediate consumption which is employed to maintain productive labourers, or to facilitate production."

The first capital of the savage is his strength; next his cunning. His conditions are so simple that there is no difficulty in recognising at once that as regards him, his might is his right. He is the only law to himself. By degrees he learns to increase his capital by the construction of weapons and tools. They are the produce of his labour saved from immediate consumption. He then finds it useful to assume the right, if he have the power, to dispose to his own advantage of the labour of weaker and less cunning men than himself. He becomes a capitalist. If he abuse his right of superior strength or cunning, *i.e.*, if he use his power unwisely and appropriate too much of the produce of the labour of the weaker and less cunning men, or withhold the usual and necessary equivalent of protection, advice, and assistance, his labourers or subjects co-operate against him; and if they have and feel the power, they strike work, and perhaps strike him. No one can dispute their perfect right to do so under the circumstances, or his right to retain their services —if he can. It is, therefore, his interest to render to them—not only an equivalent of help and security, but *more than a mere equivalent*; in order beforehand to attach them—and secure their services—to himself; rather than let them be tempted to offer them to any other equally, or more, strong and cunning savage capitalist. It is thus clearly his interest (although he rarely sees it) that a balance of services should be rendered by him in advance to them; because other capitalists are competing with him for their services, which it would be manifestly disadvantageous to lose. It seems also that it is likewise their interest that a balance of services should also, if possible, be rendered in advance by them to him; to secure the preferent advantages of his superior strength and cunning in the shape of help and security. The principal reason why men have so frequently wasted their energies in mutually ruinous quarrels is that they fail to perceive that it was thus their true interest to be always in the position of *creditors* rather than *debtors*; that a balance of services should—for their best interest—be always and as much as possible rendered *in advance by themselves;* and it is strongly corroborative of this position, that they actually instinctively recognise the truth of this principle by endeavouring—when they desire to command the services of others—to make up such a balance fictitiously by over-estimating and exaggerating their own previous services to make themselves appear creditors; too late discerning that they would have been gainers had the balance of services been really advanced by them. They had blindly left the future out of the account, though the most important part of it, as that which alone imparts value or interest to the dead past. In estimating their position they had erroneously considered that it was an advantage to have received more services than they had rendered; to be debtors rather than creditors. But not only do those we have served, but also all who have learned that we have rendered a balance of services in advance, compete with each other to secure the services of such serviceable servants, as those from whom most advantage is to be expected and gained. This affords a rational reason for labouring for the good of others, in that it is plainly our best interest to do so. And this is the explanation of the progressiveness of civilization, though all such general principles are never discerned until they have long been instinctively practised. Although the number of those who render a balance of services in advance is small, the number of those who compete for the services of each of them is much larger than that of those who fail to act upon this, the only true social principle, namely, that it is the true interest of each to render not only an equivalent, but a *balance of services in advance* to his neighbours; for this, on the only true and effective motive to morality—self interest—excites them all to compete and vie with each other in rendering services to *him*. For the interest of each one is thus obviously bound up in that of all those with whom he has the best prospect of exchanging services.

The nearly universal failure of every other system of morality results from their advocates overlooking that a motive to morality, to be valid and effective, must be one which is felt and acknowledged by those immoral persons who are insensible to the transcendental and æsthetic ones which are vainly offered to them, and which are not always operative even upon those who propose them. They overlook that it it is required to call—not the righteous, but sinners—to repentance.

The basis of social strength, security, and reciprocity, lies in the inequality of human powers and conditions. First of bodily strength; next of wit. Since there has been some security for property, one form of the latter has gained importance: the talent for the acquisition and profitable use of wealth. This is a quality as natural and peculiar as strength, and is as necessary to civilized society. The original disparity of power, by endowing some men with what others want, suggests and induces mutual exchange. It is obvious that if the strongest men were prevented by law or any effectual restriction from using all the greater strength which they possess, all that strength would be lost to society. And if it were right (that is, wise) to prevent the use by the strongest men of their extra strength, there would be the same reason why the next strongest men should be prevented from using all which they possess above the very weakest; until all stronger than the absolutely weakest man would be prevented from using more than his minimum amount of strength. All their collective greater strength would thus be lost, and all would die out as the weakest do now, and the race would become extinct.

The accumulation of wealth offers—not a parallel, but a case in which the evils of restriction are much greater. For the wealth of the capitalist is not the accumulated result of his own labour alone, but represents the collective labour of the society in which he lives; the accumulation of which by him benefits not so much himself as those who being devoid of, or less gifted by nature with, the accumulative faculty, are wholly incapable of accumulating or capitalising their own labours; or of keeping or using to advantage such accumulations if they had them. Any restriction upon or impediment to the accumulation by natural capitalists of the results of labour, simply deprives, not so much them as society—including those who accumulate nothing,—of so much accumulatable wealth. The loss is of course greater to those who cannot accumulate for themselves than for those who can.

It is only the lowest condition of savagery that can dispense with accumulations of wealth, the results of labour. They are necessary to the rudest operations of nascent commerce, as much as to the most stupendous works of modern civilization; which could never have been effected if some individuals had not possessed this curious faculty of amassing in bulk the results of the labour of those in whom the faculty was wanting. To prevent those works, would be to reduce the world to savagery again; and to impede the exercise of that faculty in those who possess it, would be to deprive those who have it not, more than those who have it, of the benefits accruing from the accumulation of the results of the labour of every one who can produce more than just enough to cover the cost of production.

It is not surprising that these relations of interdependence between labour and capital have not been generally perceived; because, although the capitalist thus unconsciously acts in the capacity of trustee of the results of the labour of the non-accumulators for their benefit, he has no perceived object in view but his own personal aggrandisement. Nevertheless, civilization, having been accomplished by his co-operation as an accumulator, proves that it was not necessary—as it was perhaps neither possible nor desirable—that he should have had any further knowledge that his function was most important as that of a social trustee of the results of the labour of others. It is only by repeated and prolonged experience of the benefits of social reciprocity that we have learned to discern and comprehend some of them, and the capitalist's business (like any other) was no doubt better and more vigorously and efficiently performed under the erroneous impression that it was for his sole advantage, and perhaps even for the disadvantage of those who, as I have shown, were really most benefited by it.

The imaginary antagonism between the interests of Labour and Capital, which has till lately prevailed, had doubtless valuable effect in stimulating labourers to ameliorate their own condition for themselves. A philanthropic capitalist like Robert Owen might temporarily amend their physical condition, but unless they learn to do it for themselves, the good done by such a man disappears with himself, or at any rate is far more partial and transient than that which they accomplish understandingly for their own benefit. A prevalent mistake appears to be the notion that the greatest benefit to the labourers is to be effected, not so much by improving and raising them by increasing their knowledge and capacity to utilise the means of happiness which are unperceived within their reach, as by pulling down the capitalist from his position of apparently greater comfort and advantage, to one in which the good that he would otherwise do for the labourers would be far more reduced than his actual superiority in wealth. But what is really subtracted legislatively from the wealth of a capitalist, or rather that which he is prevented from acquiring, cannot be added to the labourer's wages. It must be lost to both. The only way to improve the labourer's condition is not to injure another class, but to improve the labourer's; to assist and lead him to discern the advantages which lie around him, awaiting and imploring discovery and appropriation. A successful capitalist has other qualities beside the mere knack of accumulation: knowledge, method, prudence, and economy; and these may be partly acquired by thousands who can never learn to accumulate. For want of these, labourers commonly tie their own hands and preclude their own improvement by having families, as large as—nay larger, as a rule than—those with which capitalists care to burden themselves. Their reckless multiplication is the great incubus that weighs them down; by enormously increasing the supply of—and therefore diminishing the demand for—their own labour; besides engrossing the whole of their wages for mere subsistence. Their children grow up necessarily without education, having to work for bread when they should be learning to improve their unfortunate position, which becomes worse in each succeeding generation. It is now certain that no other means of improvement or relief can be more than of the slightest avail until labourers duly appreciate and relieve themselves from this oppressive disability, from which the strong and industrious—if imprudent or ignorant—cannot escape. The man with ten children earns no larger wages than another with none, and labours with almost the same disadvantage as if he carried them all upon his back.

Yet there are persons to be found who deny these effects of the pressure of population upon the means of subsistence, and assert that over-population is an impossibility in a country or a world where there are many unoccupied square miles of land. Is it not certain from experience that there must be pressure of population wherever it is concentrated? Is it not the nature of civilization to concentrate population? and must there not be over-population wherever the concentration exceeds that of the means of subsistence? If there be in the house but one man without food, or the means of getting it, is there not over-population in that house? and if a young bachelor with £500 a-year does not feel it, do not the wife and ten children of a weak or sickly man who can only occasionally earn six shillings a-day? Of what avail are millions of vacant acres at a distance to such a family in the midst of a city? As reasonable and as kind would it be to tell a man dying of thirst on a raft at sea, that there is abundance of fresh water on shore. The worst enemies of the working man are those who would deter him from seeking, and debar him from obtaining the physiological knowledge necessary to enable him to meet this one paramount difficulty in his situation.

Beyond relief, as above suggested, to overtasked efficient labourers, it is to be doubted whether more could be given without material injury to society, and particularly to the labourer himself. The enormous disparity and differentiation of human kind, necessarily involve the production of inferior types; and for every one of a certain standard above the average of intelligence, morality and efficiency, there must be another as much below that average. If the most inefficient, weakly, lazy, and criminal are to continue to be supported as at present upon the earnings of the efficient, the strong, the industrious, and the moral—the result must inevitably be the lowering of the average and the absolute deterioration of the race. It is not desirable for the evil varieties themselves any more than for the superior ones, that the former should be perpetuated at the cost of the latter. Criminals and lunatics when selected by law for extrusion should be permanently eliminated as they present themselves for the purpose. The positive checks to population are the only other means which are not fatally invidious of determining who should give place to the others in the struggle for existence. Some must be pressed out or down; and who should they be, if not the criminal, the lunatic, the stupid, the weak, the diseased, and the incompetent? The survival of the fittest is best.

It has been already shown that the real interests of labourers and of capitalists are necessarily identical. Capitalists who blindly desire the intervention of the State to increase the supply of labour to reduce its cost, interfere with the law of demand and supply in violation of the principles of Political Economy and err against their own interest, as completely as labourers who imagine that capitalists are their natural enemies. For so surely as wages fall, so must profits also diminish. What the capitalist should study is how to maintain large profits, which invariably accompany high wages. This important fact requires no proof here. Capitalists should aim at improving the *quality*, instead of increasing the *quantity* of the labour they employ; and that is best done by assisting the labourer to improve his material and intellectual condition. And for like reasons it is the best interest of the labourer that the capitalist should make large profits, and should suffer no impediments in his accumulations; because from them wages are paid, and by them the field for labour is widened.

There is a striking analogy between the relations of labour and capital in the exchange of wealth, and those of the vegetable and organic kingdoms in the exchange of the gases which they respire. The two in each case are reciprocally dependent; and the free and extensive action of one promotes that of the other. The vegetable kingdom releases the oxygen which is indispensable to the life of the animal. The latter receives and lives by it, and returns through the atmosphere the carbonic acid which is useless to it, but is essential to the respiration of the plant. So the labourer furnishes the energy which produces wealth to the capitalist; without whose economy, knowledge, and enterprise he would have no sufficient civilized work to do, or fund to pay his wages. All is harmony, in the chemical interchange of mutually necessary commodities, between the vegetable and living kingdoms. They have no misunderstandings and no antagonisms; and all that is necessary to the reign of equal harmony between labour and capital is the removal of the misunderstanding which has misled the human media of these social forces to imagine an antagonism where there is really none, and the recognition that the most perfect fulfilment of the function of either will be best served by the freest and most intelligent action of the other.

Some persons still dream that the solution of the problem is only to be found in an equal re-distribution of wealth; and property has even been described as theft. But such visionaries evidently overlook the important law of human society, of the immense and inevitable disparity of human conditions; striking enough in the savage, but steadily augmenting in the civilized state. Were an equal division to be made to-morrow morning, it would not mend the matter; for by night another division would be necessary. Nay, more so. For every one would be at a loss, and every commercial and economical function would be paralysed. The more that increasing population augments the endless division of labour—the more this diversity of conditions and capacities is multiplied, together with the special circumstances and employments to which they are most appropriate; and so much the more is the function of the capitalist, as such, indispensable to civilized society.

For two thousand years philosophers have sought to evade the results of this diversity of conditions, and to establish communities in which all the advantages of co-operation might be secured, without as in modern communism, reducing the superior and the average, individual to a level with the worst. Lycurgus lowered all thus to the condition of soldiers or savages. Plato and Aristotle recommended the extermination of all weak and imperfect children, and the payment of as much attention to breeding the best, as we use with our cattle and horses. But they all failed; though their objects were as good, and their method far more rational than our social practice. Modern communism disregards all the precautions against degeneration recommended by Plato, and its consequent tendency is to reduce all superior and average human nature to the very lowest and most inefficient type. Thus communism is the last resort of the incompetent, though it has been countenanced also by a few superior men who pity their condition, and would fain extend to them the obvious benefit of co-operation. Their experiments, however, have had but the briefest success, when in direct defiance of their own principles, the institution has been so far under the guidance and strong rule of a master mind like Robert Owen's, or of one of like relative superiority. But this cannot properly be called Communism, which is otherwise only a spurious imitation of co-operation, by which the incapable, the lazy, and the weak, finding themselves unable to compete with their superiors, are cunning enough to desire to bring all down to their own low standard. But in this spurious co-operation, it is obviously not the interest of the strongest, cleverest, and most energetic to take a share, and thereby abdicate the superiority with which nature has invested them. It is still less the interest of the human race in the present or the future that society in general should be deprived of the most efficient excellence of its best members. It is doubtless not proposed, and perhaps it is not intended, by any one thus to reduce all to the level of the worst. But that result would be inevitable; for where otherwise is the line to be drawn? There is no shade of gradation wanting between Newton's genius and a drivelling idiot's folly; between the wit of Voltaire and the ravings of a lunatic; between the astuteness of a Bismarck and *delirium tremens*. Were all these to be reduced to legislative restriction, or otherwise to a common minimum of activity and reward, what could result but social destruction? Nature, fortunately, renders Communism impossible; for this suicide of co-operation will always precede the destruction of society.

Legitimate co-operation, on the contrary, is based upon and fosters competition. It is in fact the effective social realisation of Darwin's great principle of natural selection; and is almost the only instance in which human conventionalism has not contravened the teaching of reason and nature. In contrast to nearly every conventional influence in relation to human increase, it establishes an organisation of the most capable and superior few, in self-defence against the deteriorating and average-lowering majority of the incapable and the lazy. This co-operation not only enhances to the individuals the advantages of their natural superiority, and pronounces and expands their social effect, but it also tends, by developing that superiority in their progeny in a geometrical ratio, to improve the future human race. This is Nature's method, and her only method, of *improving* the *average;* to make the most of and furnish every advantage to those whom she most highly endows; and she makes no more of those in any class below that average than she does of the savages who disappear before advancing civilization; or of the millions of acorns which serve but as the nutriment or manure for the benefit of the one which germinates and ultimately forms the oak. The survival of the fittest means that might—wisely used—is right. And thus we invoke and remorselessly fulfil the inexorable law of natural selection (or of demand and supply), when exterminating the inferior Australian and Maori races, and we appropiate their patrimony as coolly as Ahab did the vineyard of Naboth, though in diametrical opposition to all our favourite theories of right and justice—thus proved to be unnatural and false. The world is the better for it; and would be incalculably better still, were we loyally to accept the lesson thus taught by nature, and consistently to apply the same principle to our conventional practice; by preserving the varieties most perfect in every way, instead of actually promoting the non-survival of the fittest by protecting the propagation of the imprudent, the diseased, the defective, and the criminal. Thus we surely lower the average of, and tend to destroy, the human race, almost as effectually as if we were openly to resort to communism.

Co-operation has, on the other hand, a direct tendency to raise the intellectual and moral human average; enabling those who have a talent for organisation to profit individually by it more than would otherwise be possible; but the principal good that it does to the human race appears to lie in the additional pressure that it certainly brings to bear upon those who can neither work well, nor accumulate, nor co-operate. These, as least fitted to survive, are selected thus for extermination; and good citizens can all have better ground for the consolation, and should cultivate the moral feeling of the Spartan mother, who met the news of the death of her son for his country with the exclamation, "Sparta hath many a worthier son than he!"

The labouring classes have in their own hands the power, if they could only recognise its value, to lighten their poverty and their labour, and to improve themselves indefinitely; and then to reap the benefit of far larger accumulations of the proceeds of their labour than have ever yet been made. They possess the power, and lack but that knowledge which I have above recommended and which it is the interest of society that they should have.

The foregoing conclusions may be summed up thus:—

1. The interests of labour and capital must be identical, because high wages and large profits are as a rule concomitants.

2. It is the interest of capitalists, as well as of labourers, that the quality of labour should be improved rather than the quantity augmented.

3. It is the interest of labourers as well as of capitalists, that capital—from the interest upon which wages are paid—should accumulate as freely as possible.

4. The spread through all classes of the knowledge of natural laws is the best means of substituting rational harmony for the factitious antagonism which now tends to paralyse capital, and to degrade labour.

H. K. Rusden.

AN EPISODE IN CALIFORNIAN BANKING.

THE generally conservative character of English banking and the hard prosaic lives of men who devote themselves to its conduct, while they command the confidence of those pecuniarily interested, do not contain the elements out of which enthusiasm is evoked. The most solid success of modern times, that of the London and Westminster Bank, meets its highest reward in the formal vote of thanks accorded to the managing powers at the half-yearly meetings; and as this methodical compliment is passed with unswerving regularity and solemn decorum, alike as a congratulation on a good half-year or a condolence on a bad one, its value as a testimony of real feeling is open to question.

An extraordinary episode in the history of the Bank of California, which occurred in San Francisco within the last few months, places the peculiar characteristics of the American people and American banking in such vivid contrast to the reserved apathetic Englishman of the ordinary money-making type, that its details deserve a permanent record. The story of "Black Friday," the 27th August, 1875, has no parallel in the history of English panics, for those, in the great majority of instances, have been born of fear, and if sufficiently long-lived have culminated in denunciation and a desire for the punishment of the persons by whom the panic-stricken have sustained loss; but, in the case to be now considered, the whole community regarded the possible failure of the bank as a national calamity, a discredit to them individually, and they not only refrained from denunciation but refused to allow any blame to be imputed to the management, while they were untiring in their efforts to support each other in refusing to accept the apparently inevitable.

Six months ago the Bank of California undoubtedly held the pride of place amongst the financial institutions of what the 'Friscans call "the Pacific Slope." It had half a dozen local rivals, but towered above them all in the magnificence of its premises, the number of its official staff, the extent of its deposits, the varied vastness of its business ramifications, the reputed wealth of its proprietary, and above all in the unbounded personal popularity of its manager, Mr. William Chapman Ralston.

This gentleman's character for princely hospitality has been testified to by numerous tourists who have enjoyed the sumptuous appointments of his elegant mansion; while his wide-spread reputation for business shrewdness and sagacity led to his being continually consulted by intending investors and speculative capitalists, whose surplus dollars he could divert almost at will to the exploration of a new mine, the development of a new township, or the establishment of a new "local industry" that should redound to the credit of California before the world.

Essentially a self-trained man, exhibiting in a marked degree those attributes of ubiquitous adaptation of himself to his surroundings, and unfailing faith in his own ability, by no means uncommon amongst his countrymen, he made his business entry into life as a clerk on board of a Mississippi steamer, and before he had attained the age of five-and-twenty was managing the business of an extensive steamboat proprietary at the Isthmus of Panama, being afterwards transferred to San Francisco in the same employ.

He appears from his first arrival in the country to have entertained very exalted opinions of the great natural resources of California, and to have persistently predicted the wonderful future in store for it, a future which he believed inevitable in any case, but to be brought much nearer to the present by the stimulating operation of pecuniary assistance, and the diversion of accumulated capital into a thousand fructifying rills. Under the influence of his advice the wealthy shipping firm that he represented opened a private bank about the year 1855 and made him a partner. So great were the risks incurred owing to the excessive speculation and excitement with which the whole community were intoxicated, that after a very short experience the moneyed partners took the alarm and withdrew. A serious panic and temporary embarrassment followed; but so high did the reputation of Ralston stand with the mercantile public for those qualities of tact, decision, and accurate knowledge of men and business, that notwithstanding his lack of the prudence which comes of early banking training, he found no difficulty in getting others to join his firm and carry the bank on successfully up to the end of 1858.

So far he had achieved the success which most men in his profession regard as their goal. He was a successful banker, making large profits, building up a private fortune, enjoying the most implicit confidence of his clients; a social leader and a financial dictator. But he aimed higher, and chafed under the limited resources which confined him to the ordinary prosaic discounting of bills and assisting mercantile enterprise, while his heart was set upon "developing the resources" of the Pacific coast. In 1859 he planned and successfully launched the Bank of California. With ample capital, and backed by some of the wealthiest men in California, it aimed at being a national institution, and was from the first day a wonderful success. Deposits poured in from all parts of the country; the mining community took a pride in supporting an establishment that did not turn a deaf ear to their applications for assistance; it became almost the sole custodian of the funds of the stock jobbers and brokers who form so influential a class in San Francisco; that section of the citizens whom Victorians are wont to designate "land sharks," found means in its coffers for ample speculation; the merchants supported it out of personal regard and admiration of Ralston; and as it rapidly grew in power and influence, a fixed idea took possession of every mind that the proper and rapid development of the country was now assured. Nor did the action of the Bank belie the estimate formed of its capacities by the public. "Enterprises of great pith and moment" never "had their currents turned awry" for want of financial assistance, if only their prospects seemed reasonably fair in the judgment of the astute manager. Hundreds of families now in affluent circumstances owe their all to the liberal assistance and wise counsel accorded to them by Mr. Ralston at the inception of their perhaps doubtful schemes for acquiring wealth; thousands of working men have been employed for years in factories and on enterprises which no private capitalist would have pulled through their preliminary difficulties; cities have been planned, built, and occupied on sites where the primeval forest would yet be undisturbed but for the daring confidence in the great future of California which animated the manager of its representative bank. Nothing came amiss to him that tended in the direction of "development," the one dominant idea of his life.

The exploration of a new mining district; the development of a new line of reef; the laying out of a new watering place for summer resort; the construction of new water races; the building of gigantic palace hotels; the erection and management of theatres; the establishment of woollen mills, carriage factories, watch factories, steamboat companies, and every form of associated enterprise, represent some of the many phases of his business activity and financial assistance, until "I'll see Ralston about it" became the recognised preliminary to every projected undertaking of any moment.

There is no doubt that the unexampled rapidity of progress which has distinguished the history of California during the last fifteen years has been largely due to the stimulating influence and vast financial power wielded with such daring coolness by Mr. Ralston; but to avoid the inevitable end of such a departure from sound banking principles it was necessary that the progress must continue without a check. The slightest stagnation was certain ruin. While real estate or mining property could continually be sold at an advance, all was well; and as the foundations of all banking disasters are laid in the days of cheap money, so the facilities afforded to speculators forced up prices to a fictitious value; and when the limit of the bank's enormous and still growing resources was reached, the crisis came. But it was precipitated by other causes. The social *prestige* and business command acquired by Mr. Ralston in San Francisco might have passed unchallenged, but the tremendous influence which the wide-spread scattering of the bank's funds had given him over the political destinies of California and Nevada aroused a feeling of envy and opposition which was steadily fomented by the persistent attacks upon his policy in the columns of the *Bulletin*, one of the leading daily papers. Those who are familiar with the grossly personal style of the comments on daily events which distinguishes the American press, will have no difficulty in realising the nature of these attacks. His private affairs were paraded in detail and condemned *in globo*—his motives were persistently ascribed to the basest self-interest—and dark hints were continually thrown out about fearful revelations of financial rottenness which the editorial columns could and would make if their admonitions were not heeded. To intensify matters, a powerful combination of half-a-dozen enormously wealthy mine-owners in Nevada determined to start a bank in that state which should drive the existing institution out of the field. The very substantial capital of 5,000,000 dols. was at once subscribed, and the projectors, as a preliminary means of crippling their rival, succeeded in involving Ralston in the purchase of a vast amount of stocks which he was interested in supporting. By some process familiar to the stock-jobbing community, they waited until the drain of gold which had been going on at the bank for some time had reached a serious point, and then suddenly called upon him for settlement.

The joint action of the projectors of the new bank and the daily organ of his political foes culminated in "a run" on the 26th August, which the depleted coffers could not sustain. An excited crowd thronged the office all the forenoon; the tellers were doubled, and coin was paid out as fast as it could be handled. About noon the other banks refused to receive checks on the Bank of California, and the excitement deepened to terror, a frantic crowd struggling round the doors of the moribund institution and blocking the approaches.

Seeing the utter hopelessness of allaying the panic, Mr. Ralston gave orders at a quarter to three o'clock to cease paying, the office was with some difficulty cleared, and the ponderous doors were closed and guarded by a posse of police. The following day, hereafter to be known in Californian annals as Black Friday, was prolific of other suspensions and banking difficulties with which this record has no concern. The trustees of the Bank of California met in anxious deliberation and resolved to require the resignation of Mr. Ralston as a preliminary proceeding. He had already conveyed his extensive property unconditionally to one of the trustees to be dealt with as might be deemed best for the interests of the bank or its creditors. The unexpected harshness of the resolution utterly prostrated him; and without a single remark he handed in his resignation and left the bank, walking hurriedly but with dejected mien to the baths on the North Beach. The keeper of the baths remonstrated with him for proposing to bathe in his heated state, but he was a frequent visitor and a known good swimmer. He plunged into the sea, and whether by accident or design he was never seen alive again.

The doleful tidings spread rapidly over the city, and the excitement of the monetary panic was over-shadowed by the gloom which settled upon the entire community as they learned that their model financier, who had done so much for the advancement of California, had gone to his account, ruined, homeless, and abandoned by his colleagues. Flags at half-mast floated from all the public buildings, the banks, merchants' stores, and private residences, and even from the shipping in the harbour. Business was paralysed, politics were neglected, the principal factories were closed for the day; municipal councils, grand lodges, and all kinds of public bodies adjourned their proceedings as a mark of respect; even the theatres refrained from opening; and on the following Sunday nearly all the churches united in making their services special to the occasion, many columns of Monday's papers being filled with abstracts of sermons eloquent with the praises of the dead banker, and pointed with morals touching the insecurity of earthly riches.

The clerical eulogies appear to the dispassionate reader to be somewhat hyperbolical, but they convey a vivid sense of the intense and enthusiastic regard in which the man was held even outside of business circles. The Rev. W. H. Platt, of Grace Church, said of him:—"His sagacity seemed far reaching, his combinations quick and wonderful, his decisions prompt and abiding, his mental processes like flashes of lightning. Health, brain, means, seemed to be supreme and inexhaustible. He seemed to embody all the elements of success. Bankers already have their judgment of his failure, the mass of the people only know that within two days the great bank is closed, its great president dead. Commercial panic has become calm, and solemnity and sorrow hush every heart. W. C. Ralston was the life of so many enterprises, the magnetism of so many hopes, the guide in so many perplexities, that the public and individuals like a whole forest scathed by lightning, stand in blasted isolation. Mourners, indeed, go about the streets; strong men bow their heads, and all are in tears. Why is this? Why is there such unanimous sorrow? Why do flags flutter low along their staffs? Why does manhood wail, and the step of trade pause? A man of great public spirit is gone."

This is a fair sample, not only of the pulpit utterances, but of the editorial and correspondence columns of the newspapers, the latter frequently breaking into verse more or less poetical, but all alike redolent of unstinted praise. The *Bulletin*, however, regardless of the *nil nisi bonum* sentiment, continued its attacks in the face of the popular expression of opinion. It charged the dead president with fraud, bribery, corruption and deceit; with having diverted the funds of the bank into channels unknown to the directors; with being personally indebted to it in several millions of dollars, and with having culminated a life of reckless gambling in the coward's resort of suicide. The medical evidence and the coroner's jury dissipated the base slander, and the storm of public indignation recommended the application of Lynch-law to the editorial staff of the obnoxious print; until, warned by the menaces of enormous and demonstrative mass meetings, its tone became more moderate and apologetic.

The resuscitation of the bank became a necessary adjunct to the vindication of Mr. Ralston's aspersed character, and this was a sacred duty imposed upon the community whose well-being he had promoted. The misery so generally entailed upon a bank failure was never contemplated as a possibility. There was no failure, only a temporary and easily accounted-for suspension. It would be all right in a few days; it must be, and meanwhile honour must be done to the only sufferer by the collapse, and his base slanderers must be put to shame. The funeral cortege was the most magnificent ever seen in San Francisco, and extended upwards of three miles in length. All the public bodies of the state were represented in it, and it was estimated that over a hundred thousand persons were present as spectators or followers. All the places of business were closed, the city was canopied with flags at half-mast, and in the principal thoroughfares many of the houses were draped in black. In the words of one of the daily journals, "San Francisco forgot whatever of dross there was in her dead son, and remembering only his commanding genius, his labours for her welfare, and his great goodness of heart, wrapped herself in sombre robes and mourned over his grave."

The week following the funeral was one of intense excitement. Mass meeting were held in public halls and in the open air, to vindicate the policy of Ralston and to denounce the recalcitrant *Bulletin*, at which the chosen orators invariably capped their eloquence by an expressed determination to have the bank open again in a few days. But the work of examining its complicated accounts and estimating its losses could not be mastered so hurriedly. The public voice had affirmed that it must be done; and to give confidence in the ultimate result, about sixty wealthy men formed themselves into a syndicate and subscribed nearly 8,000,000 dols., which was estimated as more than sufficient to cover any possible deficiency in the assets, and to assure the safety of all depositors. This syndicate, though composed of men more or less interested as shareholders, was entirely independent of the directory and management, and merely took the form of a substantial guarantee. Their labours were completed in a few weeks, and on the 2nd October the bank resumed business.

The enthusiastic excitement of that morning was almost as intense as had been the terrified excitement of the 26th August. An hour before the doors opened an enormous crowd had gathered in front of the bank, many of them staggering under bags of coin which they were ostentatiously anxious to deposit. By ten o'clock the approaches to the bank were completely blocked, and when the doors were thrown open, cheer after cheer arose from the crowd, while flags were suddenly run up on all the neighbouring houses and stores. The distinguished honour of being the first depositor was not only struggled for at the counter, but formed the subject of newspaper controversy for several days, while those whose necessities compelled them to withdraw any portion of their funds were abject in apologetic explanations. The result of the day's business was soon known—over £200,000 was deposited in coin and about £40,000 drawn out in checks; the directors and guarantors were assured, and the citizens were jubilant that their representative institution was saved. At night many of the public buildings were illuminated, and senator William Sharon, one of the leading movers in the resuscitation, who had declared from the first that he "would pull this thing out of its trouble or spend his last stake," was the object of an enthusiastic demonstration, being serenaded at the Palace hotel with such suitable airs as "Hail to the Chief" and "See the Conquering Hero Comes." In the intervals of music he made a manly and sensible speech to the assembled thousands, and declared that the only drawback to the happiness of the moment was the absence of him who devised the magnificent structure, and under whose direction and tireless energy it had been mainly raised; whose virtues were exerted for the development of the city and the state, and were the pride of his fellow citizens. He concluded his reference to the bank by saying—"It fell like a Titan, only to rise with renewed strength to invigorate your commerce, to aid your enterprise, and to help again to furnish labour with its honest reward. Its resuscitation is without an example in the history of banking, and is largely due to the sound basis of our gold currency; but more than all to the noble and active sympathy of all classes of our citizens, to their steady confidence in the efforts of those who in restoring the bank to a new career of financial honor have but executed the popular will, and responded to the unanimous call of a great and courageous people."

He struck the key-note of the whole proceedings in these words. Conducted upon principles entirely foreign to English ideas of banking, the institution had acquired an enthusiastic regard from the community, alike unknown and unintelligible to our severely disciplined ideas. The representative Englishman has no more sentiment towards his banker than he has towards his butcher. If a borrower, he probably regards him as grasping and uncompliant; if a depositor, as one to be watched and suspected. But then the representative Englishman generally works hard for his money, and knows how to take care of it, while many of the millionaires who helped the Bank of California out of its perils had become wealthy with little exertion to themselves, by splendid successes in mining and land jobbing, the fruits of that flood-tide of prosperity which undoubtedly the Bank of California had largely helped to induce—in which all had reasonable hopes of sharing, and were therefore unwilling to allow the machinery of their financial cornucopia to be brought to a stop. But whatever the causes, the result is certainly a remarkable instance of popular confidence, and the irresistible power of public opinion backed by enthusiasm and pluck; the most astounding fact being that to this hour no statement has been vouchsafed to the public of the relative position of the assets and liabilities of the model Californian Bank.

HENRY G. TURNER.

THE BASIS OF NATIONAL PROSPERITY.

THE chief problem which statesmen have to solve is how to make their country, in the most comprehensive sense of that word, prosperous. This, it may be presumed, is the end which every capable politician who is freighted with the smallest grain of patriotism sets before him. Not to sate a hunger of office and power; not to juggle with figures and phrases; not to outwit the policy, or to steal a march upon the trade of a neighbour; but to secure soundness and vitality in every department of national life, and a rate of progress which will be sure rather than brilliant. Every intelligent citizen also will admit that the prosperity of the nation concerns him, and is an end towards which he is willing to lend his influence; a willingness which is doubtless increased by the consideration that in these democratic times each man is an integer of the State, and individual and national prosperity are very closely linked. No doubt selfish aims which are detrimental to the interest of the nation may be and are pursued by many members of the community, and may result in the enrichment and elevation of the individual. While, however, exceptional instances of individual prosperity may exist side by side with symptoms of national decadence—instances worthy of a past age, when the barons of Europe waxed fat in funds and lands, and vassal and villein were little better than serfs, and kingdoms went to wreck—it is clear that under a system of representative government and general taxation the prosperity of the State cannot exist without the prosperity of the individual. A flourishing treasury implies a vigorous commerce and the growth of private fortunes. Assuming, then, that statesman and citizen have one common end in view, and that end the general prosperity of their country, the question of method at once arises. How best may this desirable object be compassed ? In a colony like Victoria the question is invested with ten-fold importance. It is also freed from the thousand and one complications of privileged classes, antique laws, and despotic customs which beset the statesmen of older countries. They, in endeavouring to rebuild, are compelled to pull down, and in performing that operation have to act as gingerly as may be, lest they bring the whole fabric of the State about their ears. Out of respect to the twin-idols of Conservatism, tradition and possession, they are obliged to build in to their new political systems heaps of antiquated rubble, and to leave standing half rotten courses and cracked pillars, which they proceed to buttress and whitewash with patriotic devotion. A merciful providence has delivered us from all these risky and intractable problems by the one blessed circumstance that we have no past. Like our great progenitor when he turned his back on the Garden of Eden, the world is all before us; unlike him, our conscience is not tortured by the memory, nor our action hampered by the effects of a fall. We can begin at the beginning, and are in point of fact laying foundations, the extent and stability of which will determine the future character and prosperity of our country. It is of unspeakable moment that we should do this initial work well; and that our children of the twentieth century should think of us not as purblind and selfish bunglers who ruined the national health by political quackery and trade-fetters, but as pioneers of Australian greatness, diligent, far-sighted and wise, who knew how to "take occasion by the hand," and who by legislation and social labours gave substantial guarantees of a noble and prosperous future.

National prosperity in the modern and only true sense of that term implying the greatest good of the greatest number, it may be premised that the means to be employed for attaining this desirable end must be general rather than special. That is to say, it cannot be secured by the activity of a particular class, or by the imposition of an arbitrary statute. Nations cannot be galvanised into enduring vitality by a shock from a political battery, or attain health by dosing themselves with economical drugs. The movement must be general that is to result in a general advance, and the means at once fundamental and comprehensive that are to secure the welfare of a whole people. For which reason, paradoxical as the statement may seem, despotism itself is not powerful enough, nor is socialism radical enough for the purpose. The first can only make machines of a people; and the second, besides being nothing but despotism under another name and form, carefully extracts the main incentive to individual, and therefore also to organised labour, by putting the community into a cast-iron mould, within the rigid limits of which liabilities and profits must alike be confined. In a word, the means to be adopted must be such as, giving an impulse of growth and enterprise to each unit of the community, each individual cell of the body politic, will also ensure ample room for profitable and healthy expansion, and contribute to the formation of a well-knit, muscular, and active frame.

A further preliminary reflection may be worthy of note, viz., that the time in which we in Victoria are called to consider these important questions, and settle the basis of our future, is exceptionally favourable. History, science and statistics are daily pouring out their treasures at our feet. In our own day, for the first time in human experience, historical records have been put through critical sieves, and many of the manuscript husks that choked and deluded past generations have been given to the wind and the flames. By diligent analysis and acute comparison, the modern school of historians, represented by Buckle and Lecky, have laid bare the causes of national growth and decay by recalling the student from the mazes of court intrigues, the plots of diplomacy, and the manœuvres of battle-fields, to the study of principles and tendencies and laws. Never before have the founders of a nation been in so favourable a position for estimating truly the character and policy of peoples whose doings have become a memory, or for profiting alike by their failures and successes. The marvellous progress of the physical sciences has dowered us with a combination of wisdom and wealth which rightly used will enable us to avoid the mistakes which have retarded the industrial progress and ruined the public health of older communities. Above all, the reliable and exhaustive statistics relating to every department of national activity in all civilized states which are now available to the political student, place him on a vantage-ground far above his predecessors, and render it possible to determine the elements and conditions of national prosperity with almost mathematical accuracy. By these yearly returns of European and American governments, we see that some problems in political economy are actually being solved in the only way in which such questions can be determined, viz., by experience. We are thus put in possession of results, that is of materials with which the higher statesmanship is mainly concerned, results incontrovertible as a law of nature, secured to us without the cost of experiment and purchasable for a few shillings. Lastly, though by no means of least importance in the list of our advantages, the wide diffusion of general knowledge has not only raised the standard of popular intelligence but increased the popular capacity for understanding public questions, and so has made the task of founding a wise and prosperous democracy comparatively easy.

It is a common fallacy, which, despite historical examples to the contrary, still clings tenaciously to the human mind, that in order to prosperity a country must have ample resources within itself. That its material wealth must be such that if need be it could shut its doors like China against the world, and feed and enrich its population with their own produce and industry, permitting custom-house, harbour and commerce to become obsolete both in use and name. That rich pasture-lands, arable plains, intersected by fertilising rivers and dominated by mountain tracts, the native home of ores and coal, are the elements of national greatness. No doubt, other things being equal, a country of great resources would prosper more rapidly than a country the resources of which were limited. But no two nations can be said to be absolutely identical in their political systems, their social character and institutions, their commercial enterprise and their industrial activity. And even if two such nations existed, and one of them was handicapped by barren tracts of country, a rock-girt coast and an inhospitable climate, while the other was rich in bays and rivers, woods, and lands and mines, it is quite possible that by enterprise and skill, qualities which cannot be set down in figures or acres, and never figure among the assets of a national balance-sheet, the poorer might outstrip the richer in the race for wealth and power. It is the wisdom to use rather than the luck to possess which is the guarantee of prosperity, as some nations have found to their credit and others to their cost. It is no secret that the consciousness of wealth is apt to breed conceit in the mind and indolence in the frame, a fact which will bear wider application than to the individual. The fool in the parable whose well-stocked barn was too much for his common sense and manhood, is a type of the society or the State that is too deeply impressed with its own sufficiency. A sense of comfort and an absence of any difficulty in working out that main problem of existence which is well described as "making both ends meet," are conditions admirably calculated to develope lotus-eating in the nation as well as in the individual. Some one has said that a community may go mad as well as an individual, a truth which is getting admirably illustrated in Victoria at the present moment, a political monomania having seized a section of the population, and driven them to clamour for a dissolution of Parliament without rhyme or reason. In like manner, a nation largely dowered with natural wealth may relapse into the condition of the tropical savage, who lies alternately gazing and dozing under the fruit-laden branches of the banana and palm. Two historical examples, which are familiar enough to the general reader, may serve to show the soundness of the position that national resources are far from being the only, or even the chief elements of national prosperity. Not long before the modern development of commerce and manufacture, which has revolutionised our ideas of wealth, and created new and boundless resources as if by magic, Spain was the richest country in Europe. The golden Indies were locked within the national treasury, and the mines yielded handsomely, and gave promise of inexhaustible supplies. Her brilliant soldiers, Cortes and Pizarro, whose daring exploits put romance to shame, had enriched her by the gift of a continent. That magnificent country, rightly named a new world, running through every climate, and containing every product of the globe, and the extent and resources of which even yet leave a sense of bewilderment on the mind, was laid by destiny at her feet. But gold and brains can never be safely divorced. While the wealth of the West was in her pocket, she lacked the ballast of sense in her head. Her material resources were infinite, but her administrative wisdom was infinitesimal. The filthy lucre rolled like a current of pollution through the land, leaving not one department of the State, and scarcely one official, unsmirched; whatever was not squandered in bribery being dedicated to the pious mania of devastation and wholesale murder, till at last the political genius that had been so predominant in the councils of Sovereign and Pope became dwarfed and shrunken through priestcraft and luxury and insane bungling. The government was a vast sieve through which money ran like water; its credit was gone, so that not even a Jew would lend it a stiver, and it was reserved for the richest country in Europe to break like a common bank, and to perpetrate in the person of Philip II., that sainted fiend of modern history, the most stupendous fiscal crime on record by repudiating all its debts. And what of her Western possessions? Why, the new world slipped away from her as though it had been a floating Delos, because she had neither the wit to use it nor the fibre to keep it. The countries which her sons discovered and conquered are now feeding millions, and their industries have built many a gigantic fortune that would have made the tenants of the old Escurial stare and gasp, and are enriching the world; but in all their wealth Spain has no share. Her once gigantic American possessions have dwindled till nothing is left but Porto Rico and Cuba, the latter of which is destined ere long to become an independent republic, or, which is perhaps quite as probable, to be merged in the greater republic of the United States.

An example on the other side is Holland, which from being the vassal rose to be the rival and conqueror of Spain. A land of heath and sand and swamps, over much of which the ruinous sea-tides swept, and which the scientific explorers of these centuries would have condemned as an irreclaimable waste. A land not only without the resources which are commonly held essential to national existence, but in which the people had to fight with the sea for their very fields and lives—a fight which is maintained to this day at an annual cost to the nation of not less than half a million sterling—and yet a land which through the plodding and tenacious industry, the political wisdom and the well-directed enterprise of its inhabitants, rose to be one of the foremost and wealthiest countries in Europe; and her merchant fleets, her manufactories, her armies, her colonies, were the wonder and envy of the world. No instances can prove more conclusively that the capital of brain and muscle is worth immeasurably more than a capital represented by unfailing mines and boundless tracts of country, and that national prosperity is by no means the natural sequence of national property.

Another popular fallacy is that the welfare of a people is rendered absolutely certain by the adoption of a perfect political system; that representative institutions, free-trade, and an effective police are the golden keys to prosperity. One might with equal reason expect to transform a Fijian savage into a perfect gentleman by encasing him in the artistic garments of a Collins-street tailor. The genius, the instincts, the capacities of a people ought always to determine the character of their institutions, and will certainly have far more influence over their fortunes than the cut of the political clothes they may chance to wear. This though not fully stated is yet clearly implied by Plato, who in his master sketch of an Ideal Republic insists not so much upon the need of a perfect method of government as upon the need of training agencies by which the character and capacity of the people will be moulded to the requisite shape and use. Most philosophers admit that a republic is theoretically the best form of government, but the axiom breaks down in particular applications. Republics have been the tragedy and almost the ruin of France, and there can be no doubt that that country of "ideas" and "glory," in spite of what certain Frenchmen assert to the contrary, and however melodramatically they protest their undying attachment to *la liberté*, has always flourished best under a paternal despotism. True freedom has its roots in the national instincts and not in the national institutions. Spain again has frequently possessed representative government. Before the reign of the great Ferdinand, the Cortes were more powerful than the sovereign, and if the Spanish parliament was gradually shelved by the usurpations of the court it was surely because the national instinct of liberty was not strong enough to preserve it. At the beginning of the present century it got a bran-new constitution, which has been tinkered and improved, and which a despotically-minded sovereign has occasionally put in his pocket for a change. Now it has got a Senate and a Congress, and struts about in political clothes of an American pattern. But what have the Cortes done for Spain, or what are they likely to do? The history of the country for the last 300 years is a burlesque on the institutions they typify; and Spain, instead of attaining the goal of prosperity, has attained the zero of political existence. If one country flourishes under despotism and another is ruined notwithstanding her frequent adoption of representative institutions; if America flourishes in spite of her protective tariff, and Germany is free and happy and prosperous notwithstanding the censorship and inquisition of her State-officials, it cannot be argued that a given political system is the sole condition of national welfare.

Without augmenting the list of false notions which drive men off the track of sound and enduring prosperity, and without multiplying examples to show that right systems and methods do not necessarily enrich, nor wrong ones necessarily ruin a people, I proceed to the statement that the character of the people, its physical, mental and moral fibre, is the determining element of a nation's career. Resources and institutions are simply the implements of character; they are but the machinery to which it is the motive-power and by which it can transform or destroy or create. It is not the Roman Empire but the Roman character that we see through the mists of history glorified by the arms of conquest and the arts of peace. We revere not the legions nor the Senate nor the vast resources which were laid under tribute; but the genius that made the legions invincible and the senate wise, that permitted no field to lie fallow which could yield wealth and power to the court of Rome, and knit the heterogeneous provinces into one compact and flourishing empire. Salamis and Marathon and Thermopylæ are memories not of Greek politics but of Greek character. It is English character—in the barons under John, in the commoners under the Stuarts, in Cromwell and Hampden, and in kindred spirits of every estate of the realm, and not English institutions—that has wrought out and perfected the liberties and fortunes of England. Now character is the net result of training and inheritance. And although modern science bids us and rightly bids us find the origin of many of our virtues and vices in the tissues and habits and mental biases of our progenitors, it cannot be denied that training—wisely-directed culture of the physical and mental and moral faculties—is the most powerful known agent in shaping individual and national character. As new lights continue to be thrown by research upon the past it becomes clear that many noble characteristics of the leading peoples of history are much more largely due to their culture than to their descent. The instinct of freedom, over which so much rhetoric and poetry have been wasted, is after all but a savage instinct until by adequate social and political culture it is transformed from a blind and desperate defence against change into an intelligent and systematic resistance to injustice and tyranny. This instinct was never stronger in any people than in the Cymri of Britain, and yet their fighting is like nothing so much as the desperate valour of wild beasts brought to bay in their lair. In the Spartans and the Argives, on the contrary, this instinct had been tutored into a principle, and the conquests and prosperity of ancient Greece were closely linked with her culture. It was the discipline first of the character and then of the daily life in camp and field that made the Roman legions invincible and gave the city of Romulus the crown of the world; not the fierce fluid that spouted from the breasts of his wolf-mother, and ran through the veins of his children. The people that place any trust in uncultured instincts are savages, and are doomed, as all history proves, to be trampled out by the power-shod feet of mind. Especially is it true that national prosperity is the direct purchase of education in some of its forms, and most commonly in all. Far too little emphasis has been laid upon the fact that the two nations of antiquity, which most nearly realised what we now understand by national prosperity, were precisely the two most cultured nations in the world. There have been great empires without diffused culture; but the despotism of the Tigris and the Nile crushed out every germ of national life in the interest of court and caste, and no one out of Bedlam would assert that anything akin to national prosperity existed under the reign of Aurungzebe or Tamerlane. If culture was so intimately linked with power and popular welfare in ancient, it is doubly so in modern times. Beyond all question, the foremost nation of Europe to-day is Germany, and Germany is precisely the one country in Europe in which the people have been systematically educated and disciplined. The policy of Bismarck has done much, but the thorough culture and discipline of Prussia have done more towards the creation and ascendancy and prosperity of the German Empire. It is no secret that the Prussian success in the late French campaign was largely owing to the diligent study of maps of the territory to be invaded. The battles were all fought in the closet of Von Moltke long before the troops defiled and the cannon roared beside the Rhine. It was geography against *la gloire*, science against bounce that fought on those historic battle-fields, and won the coveted prize from France, and placed the Imperial crown upon the brow of William. The decline of Spain, whose unhappy destiny it is to furnish the moralist and historian with more "shocking examples" than all other modern nations put together, is to be directly traced to ignorance, ignorance of the most rudimental principles of political economy on the part of its successive rulers, and ignorance the most dense and shameless of the first elements of education on the part of the people. No one need marvel at the condition of Spain who knows that at the beginning of the present century there was scarcely a peasant or workman in the kingdom who was able to read, and it was considered absolutely immoral for a woman to know her letters. And although immense improvements have been made since, yet when the last census was taken, out of a total of 16,000,000 of population there were only 3,000,000 of persons who could both read and write. If space permitted, the same argument, viz., that education, comprehensively understood, is the guarantee, and ignorance the cancer, of national prosperity, might be further supported by the examples of Holland, whose culture has been world-famous for centuries, and whose people have always been distinguished for their intelligence, industry, and cleanliness; of England and America, whose extraordinary prosperity is traceable to the mental activity and self-reliance of the people themselves, the fruit of long and painful discipline; of France, whose signal humiliation at the hands of the cultured Prussian warriors has emphasised the fact that the public education is lamentably backward and defective, and that according to the latest census returns thirty per cent. of the population of the country that but lately aspired to lead Europe and the nineteenth century were utterly destitute of the merest rudiments of education. This paper, however, is already long enough, and the examples given must suffice.

Even if history did not impress this lesson upon us, and we could read nothing but the motto "Might is right" scrawled in brutal hieroglyphs over the annals of the past, it is certain that we have now reached a time when science is the victor-force and culture is destined to wear the crown of empire. Whatever may be said of the past, nothing is more certain than that the future belongs to knowledge, to the nation that realises the ideal of Goethe for the individual, the thorough cultivation and harmonious development of every faculty, physical, mental and moral; to the people that know most profoundly, and apply with the greatest promptitude and vigour the secrets of nature, the teachings of science, and the springs and principles of human action. The battle is no longer to the strong but to the wise. The three R.'s and their sequences are destined to outwit diplomacy, and the college henceforth has more shaping power than the court. The national ignoramus will inevitably gravitate to the nadir of political and commercial life, and the national student whose muscles and mechanisms give form and vitality to the ideals of the brain, will rise to the zenith of prosperity and power. If ever ignorance has been bliss, that time has long since vanished, and it will never pay man or nation again to be a dunce.

The application of the foregoing reflections to the present and future condition of Victoria is so patent, that it scarcely requires to be drawn out in words. Nothing can be more injurious to our prosperity or more calculated to arrest our progress than self-complacence, than the notion that our institutions, and our social and political agencies are absolutely perfect. The times are tropical, fruit of all kinds rapidly ripens, and as rapidly decays. Good things become bad by the simple process of keeping them too long. In these days, so fertile of life, and therefore, such is the law of the universe, so full of change, stagnation is directly fatal to man or state. Only the people who can say—

> "Let the great world spin for ever down the ringing grooves of change,"

and are content to spin with it, can be safe and prosperous. In all conscience, considering the exceptional advantages we have enjoyed, and the experience of older and larger nations which has guided us, there is not so very much in the position of Victoria to be proud of. It would have been an eternal shame to us, with our glorious British inheritance, living under the stimulus of European culture and American enterprise, and in a time when political experiments are so numerous and suggestive, if being free to do as we chose, we had not initiated something worthy of life and imitation. Nevertheless, some well-marked symptoms of colonial conceit have manifested themselves—sad illustrations by the way of the paradox that the less pride has to feed on the fatter it gets—and there is some little danger that we may get intoxicated with the sense of our own virtues. Against this tragical possibility it is the duty of every citizen and statesman and writer to guard, for every such sentiment is a direct drag upon the progress of the colony. It is unfortunately true that universal suffrage has not made our electors a whit more competent to vote, and that the ballot-box has not made either electors or candidates any more honest. There are shameful defects in our electoral system, and occasionally gigantic administrative blunders are perpetrated which remain as monuments of Governmental imbecility and squandered public funds. And those evils are mainly the result of ignorance, and consequent incapacity reigning from one end to the other of our representative system of Government. If thousands of our voters are incapable of deciding a political question on its merits, and vote for local roads and bridges, for periods rounded with "the working man's friend," for personal spite, for "auld lang syne," or for the stiffest nobbler that they can get, not of course as a bribe, but for refreshment, it is equally certain that many of the politicians who aspire to lead the people and manipulate the revenue returns, are men without a suspicion of mental culture or discipline, the crudity of whose views on the most practical questions, as shown in the speeches both in and out of the House, is a standing danger and disgrace to the colony. It is high time that we woke up to the truth that self-government can only be safe and successful when the people are educated; and also that we arrived at the frank admission that we are not an educated people. While the majority of our voters are uncultured, both as regards general knowledge and practical subjects, ignorance holds the keys of power, and must fling perpetual obstacles in the path of our progress. It may be hoped that when the elementary Education Act, which it is our boast that we possess, but which it should be our most anxious care that we administer wisely and firmly, has been in operation for a generation or two, many of the dangers arising immediately from ignorance will disappear. But we shall make a serious mistake if we rest from our educational labour at this stage. We are on the right track, but rudimental legislation should not be regarded as final. Not only should the system of public education already in existence be made compulsory, in fact as well as in name, so as to remove the reproach of absolute ignorance from the electors and citizens of the future, but the system itself must be made more complete. Details of the improvements and additions necessary to make the course of Victorian education thorough and exhaustive cannot here be entered on, the object of this paper being simply to emphasise the fact that prosperity of the best and highest kind is absolutely dependent upon the national character we form for ourselves by education. The benevolent instincts and the selfish aspirations of our nature join in urging us to take those steps which will tend to make us rich and pure and powerful, and cleanse us and our children from the fatal blot of ignorance. At present there is a vast chasm betwixt our public school system and the University, which must be bridged speedily and wisely, so that the poorest child in the country may find the path of learning easy to him, and may travel, needing no passports save those of ability and diligence, from his A B C to his degree. Physical and moral education, too, of a far more thorough kind than is now attempted, should be included in the State curriculum; for it is not only necessary that our children should be well informed in mind, but that they should be healthy and vigorous in body, and just and humane in their principles. By attention to the health, to the morals, and to the mental discipline of the thousands of children who by Act of Parliament have become wards of the State; and by the enforcement on society of those practices and conditions that conserve the physical tissue, and strengthen the moral fibre, and foster the commercial enterprise and augment the political capacity of a people, we shall be able by and by to afford the boast that we are an educated people, and then our future will prove that we have found and laid the true Basis of National Prosperity.

T. F. Bird.

BRAIN WAVES.

AFTER deducting from the well-known phenomena of Spiritism those which may be explained as tricks in conjuring, or which have, at any rate, been repeatedly and successfully imitated by professed conjurors, there still remain some which are sufficiently curious and even wonderful, which arrest the attention of the least credulous, inducing, not infrequently, a belief that there must be something in the claims put forward by the adherents of Spiritism for intercourse between mediums and the spirits of the departed. I propose in this short paper to show that it is possible to explain these phenomena by analogy with some well-known facts in natural science. For the scientific reader this might be done in a few words, but as the majority of those who will read these pages are probably but little versed in the terms and the results of scientific investigations, I shall venture to explain those which I must use somewhat more fully than otherwise would be necessary. The problem to be investigated will be best stated by an example; I select one out of many which occur to me because it came under my own ken, and the facts are beyond dispute. About two years ago I spent an evening with an intimate friend, who, I then learned for the first time, possessed so-called "mediumistic power." This he had kept secret because he was averse to using his power even in private; his success shocked and alarmed him, and he was unwilling to believe in the theories of the Spiritists, but yet saw no alternative. I suggested that an alternative might be found, briefly expounded the theory set forth in this paper, and begged that he would allow me to test its conclusions; to this request he assented. The test proposed was crucial: I wrote a question on a slip of paper, which I folded up and put into my pocket without showing it; it may be represented by the following query: "Will John Jones return to me the book which I lent to him?" Directly the answer was written by the "medium," who was blindfold, I seized the paper and read the reply: "John Jones, who is now in Surrey, will not return your copy of 'In Memoriam,' but James Brown will give you a copy." It will be understood that the exact question and answer have for obvious reasons been altered, but those which are given are very close equivalents for the real ones. No one but myself has ever yet seen either the question or the answer. Now I must observe about the question that the loan, the name of the book, that of the borrower and his *habitat*, were perfectly well known to the medium; and with respect to the answer, I had very good reason to believe that my "In Memoriam" would not come back, and that my friend Brown was about to present me with a new copy, which he afterwards did. Subsequently I proposed a question concerning facts of which I was quite sure that the medium was as ignorant as I was of the correct answer; in this case the question was referred to pretty accurately, but the answer proved to be very wide of what was right. From these typical examples, supported by many others, I conclude that a medium is able to produce only that which emanates from the brain of the querist, and that he gives in answer only that which already exists, perhaps unconsciously, in the mind of the inquirer. I will here observe that this power is not peculiar to those who are either professional or amateur mediums, but it may frequently be observed in the case of people who are very intimate friends, between whom there is a *rapport*, an undefined understanding, a oneness of thought and feeling, or a very strong sympathy. How frequently it happens that each of two friends is conscious of the thoughts and feelings of the other! Yet in this case nobody pretends to attribute the knowledge to the intervention of spirits. This communication between mind and mind I believe is due to the propagation of "brain-waves"; it remains for me to show what is meant by the phrase, and how it happens that waves proceeding from one brain, and undoubtedly to the brains of all present, do not in all excite consciousness of the mental emotions of the mind whence they come. To prove the existence of those waves, and to establish *a priori* the limitation which I have just indicated, a limitation which experience has practically established, is impossible; I propose only to show that the theory is not impossible, and that it is more in accordance with reason and with experience than the other wide-spread hypothesis that the phenomena are due to spiritualistic influences; it must rest with each for himself to choose the explanation which he will accept. Let us in the first place be clear as to the meaning of the term "wave." The word naturally suggests to the non-scientific reader the example to which the word is in common language applied, viz., a disturbance propagated on the surface of water, and thence metaphorically to a similar motion on a field of standing corn, or even in a crowd of human beings. But strictly, it is applied* to the transmission in any medium, whether solid, liquid, or gaseous, of a relative state of particles, the motion of each particle being a reciprocating motion, *i.e.*, a motion of which a pendulum affords a good example. That a wave may be produced, we see that two things are necessary—a motion or disturbance to be propagated and a medium of particles of matter by which the transmission of the motion is effected. A very clear idea of the production and transmission of a wave may be obtained by a simple experiment, which probably all have performed, with a piece of string. Fasten one end of the string to a nail in a wall, and taking the other end in the hand pull the string nearly tight; if now the hand be suddenly raised and then lowered, the up and down motion of the bit of string in the hand is communicated to the piece next to it, and by this piece to the next, and so on until every piece of the string has moved up and then down, each bit performing its motion a little after the preceding bit. The appearance of the string I need not describe. The result is the propagation of a wave along the string, and the nail is pulled by the bit of string in connection with it, first up and then down. In a similar way if a stone be dropped into water a wave is transmitted along the water in every direction, the motion of each particle of the water being an up and down motion, which may easily be verified by watching the behaviour of a cork floating on the surface. Not only is motion thus transmitted along a string and on the surface of the water, but the motion of a rapidly vibrating body is propagated through the air, and the particles of air in contact with the drum of the ear act upon it as the string did on the nail; the brain takes cognizance of the impulses in the drum, and the sensation called sound is produced. In a very similar manner the motion of the particles of a "luminous" body is transmitted by waves through a medium which pervades all space, and produces, through the intervention of the eye, the sensation called light. So too heat and electricity are conveyed along metal rods and wires and other bodies, there being good reason to suppose that these as well as sound and light are not matter, but states or modes of motion in the particles of matter. The existence of these waves in the case of sound and light is evident not only directly by the result produced on the ear and eye, but indirectly by their effect on inanimate bodies, and this effect has an important and instructive bearing on the subject under consideration. Every one must have noticed that when a piano is being played in a room containing glass vases, on some particular note being strongly sounded, it frequently happens that a vase will ring out with a sound either the same as the note struck or related to it as its octave; it will be found on trial that the note emitted by the vase is that which it produces on being struck; any other note on the piano, though played loudly, will fail to produce any effect in making the vase sound. This is due to the waves of a particular length (*i.e.*, having a certain distance between consecutive *crests)* setting the particles of the vase in vibration; it then becomes itself a source of disturbance and produces air waves which reach the ear and give the sensation of sound. It is the difference in the length of the wave which corresponds to difference of tone in sound, and of colour in the case of light; and by a definite law only the waves which are connected with those emitted by the vase when it is struck will cause it to vibrate and produce a sound. There is a similar and more striking phenomenon in the case of light waves. Probably all my readers know that when a beam of ordinary light is passed through a prism and falls on a screen it appears there as a coloured band or spectrum, red at one end and violet at the other. The prism has in fact separated the different kinds of light from one another, those having shorter wave length, *e.g.* violet, being more deflected from the original direction of the beam than those having a longer wave length, *e.g.* red. But beyond the violet end of the spectrum there are waves whose wave-length is so small as to be incapable of giving the sensation of light when they impinge on the retina of the eye. Yet their existence can be plainly demonstrated; for if a little beyond the violet end of the spectrum there be placed certain salts of uranium (*e.g.* the chromate), or a solution of sulphate of quinine, or a decoction of the bark of the chesnut tree, the selected substance becomes brightly illuminated, although to all appearance no light impinges upon it. Here the very short waves cause the particles of the substance in question to vibrate, and they give rise to waves whose length is connected, indeed, with that of the impinging waves, but is not the same, but shorter, and they, in consequence, give rise to the sensation of light. We thus see that it does not necessarily follow that a body becomes luminous because waves of light fall upon it, nor does it follow that waves of light produce the sensation of light in the eye, although no doubt the retina is affected by them. Hitherto I have stated bare facts, well known to a tyro in science, but I have dwelt upon them somewhat at length for the sake of the non-scientific reader. I will now state the theory which I base upon these facts. **When a man thinks, his brain is doing work—actual physical work—the particles of brain matter are in a state of motion, of rapid vibration,** just as the muscular fibres of the arm are when a man lifts a weight by a pull of the arm.* Now, what becomes of this brain energy? It may give rise to waves along certain nerves, and this nervous energy may give rise to muscular energy, as when a man wills to raise his arm and the arm rises. Moreover it is well established that brain-work may go on after the will ceases to act; everyone knows how, after a great and unavailing effort to remember a name it will suddenly flash out without any exercise of the will; the brain has been set to work by the exercise of the will, and has continued to do its work independently of the will, and by this process of "unconscious cerebration" the problem of memory has been solved; cerebration whether conscious or not implies vibration of the particles of the brain, just as heat, electricity, or any other form of energy implies a certain state of motion in the particles of the hot or electrified body. We have only to suppose the existence of a medium, analogous to that of the luminiferous ether, to have all the conditions necessary for the propagation of the motion of the brain particles, *i.e.*, for the production of "brain waves." If this be allowed, the unconscious communication of ideas follows as of course; the waves produced by one brain impinge on all others within reach, but the recipient brain is not always to those waves in the condition of the glass vase to certain waves of sound, or the sulphate of quinine to those of certain kinds of light—there may not be any subsequent sensation; but on the other hand there may be: and it is in this case that thought, even when unconscious, may be communicated. Our ignorance of the nature of the brain motion forbids the pushing of the analogy very far, but it seems reasonable to suppose that even when mental sensation is produced through the instrumentality of the brain receiving brain waves, it will not of necessity follow that in all cases the sensation is quite the same as that which gave rise to the waves; there will be a greater or less resemblance according to the degree of consonance so to speak existing between the brains.

---

*See Airy's tract on the Undulatory Theory of Optics, Art. 1.

The term "Brain Wave" was originally used, I believe, to denote a wave transmitted to the brain along the nerves from any part of the body which might be affected. For want of a more expressive term, I have used it here in a different sense.

The theory here briefly, and I confess rather hastily, set forth may to some appear extravagant; but it has, as I have attempted to show, analogues; it is impossible to demonstrate the existence of the luminiferous ether; we only infer that it exists from the agreement between deductions from the wave theory of light and the results of experiment; its existence was probably suggested by the analogy between some of the phenomena of light and of sound, and similarly by analogy the existence of a medium for the propagation of Brain Waves suggests itself. The extravagance of the theory is, however, thrown into the shade, it seems to me, by the wild absurdities of the Spiritists.

---

* This motion of the muscular fibres can be perceived by placing the ear close to the arm, when its muscles are in a state of tension; it gives rise to a peculiar and unmistakable noise.

H. M. ANDREW.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS IN VICTORIA.

UNDER a title similar to the above will be given in future numbers of the *Melbourne Review* a brief epitome of the events of public interest which have occurred during the quarter. In the present issue the scope of this article will be somewhat more extended, and we shall pass under review the occurrences of the year now closing.

Turning first to political affairs, we find that the past twelve months are remarkable as the most fertile in administrative changes, and the most barren in legislation, of the twenty years our present form of constitution has existed. The second session of the eighth of our Parliaments met on the 25th of last May, and though at the date of writing it is still sitting, it has produced no change whatever in our Statute Book, unless the passage of three Supply and two private bills, can merit that distinction; nor does there seem any probability that the few remaining days of the year will be more productive of legislation than the last eight months. Though, however the present session is thus ignobly distinguished as regards law-making it is unique as having witnessed three Ministries in office; the Kerferd Government, under whose auspices it was opened, having been succeeded by the Berry Ministry, and that in turn having had to yield to Sir J. M'Culloch and his colleagues.

So remarkable an outcome of responsible government cannot but be a subject for serious and anxious thought both for the philosophical observer and the practical colonist who has the interest of his country at heart. Accordingly we find the most eminent supporter of so-called liberal opinions in our Assembly, warning his fellow-members that they will bring democratic bodies into disgrace; while one of our leading papers points the gloomy moral that all governments, howsoever limited or extended may be their basis, must alike decay and become effete.

A consideration of the circumstances which have produced such unfortunate consequences may perhaps throw some light on the important question, whether the ineptitude in law-making and the instability of administration which have characterised the present session are due to inherent defects in our form of government, or are merely passing phases of it.

At the opening of the session the Kerferd Ministry appeared to have a long and successful term of office before them; they produced a programme of future legislation sufficiently extensive to satisfy the most ardent advocates of parliamentary interference in everything; and though some of their proposals were scarcely worthy of a place in a Governor's speech, others, such as those regarding the Land Laws, the Public Service and the Adjustment of the Incidence of Taxation, related to subjects on which all parties were agreed that speedy legislation was necessary. Their address was carried without amendment, and during the first month nine bills on various subjects were introduced by members of the Government.

The first serious symptom of dissatisfaction with the Ministry was shown on 6th July, when Mr. Service proposed to postpone his financial speech until the fate of the Land Act had been settled; owing to the strong disapprobation expressed by all sections of the Opposition he had to explain that his statement referred to that part of the bill only which affected the revenue.

On the 15th of the same month the Treasurer made his budget speech, which disclosed a serious deficiency in the revenue, notwithstanding skilful manipulation of the accounts so as to throw as many liabilities as possible into the following year. We need not weary our readers with an account of the various changes in taxation which Mr. Service proposed; they are no doubt familiar to all who take an interest in such matters. At present we are chiefly concerned with the political aspect of the session.

On the 21st July, Mr. Berry moved that the financial proposals of the Treasurer were unsatisfactory, and the Government gained a decisive victory, the resolution being negatived by 32 votes out of a House of 54 exclusive of the Chairman of Committees and the Speaker. On the 29th of July, however, the Government found itself with a majority of one only in a larger house, on the first of the tariff resolutions, that raising the duty on spirits. This the Ministry chose to consider as a test vote and equivalent to a defeat; they advised the Governor to dissolve Parliament; and their request being refused, tendered their resignations, which were accepted, and on 10th August the Kerferd Ministry ceased to exist. Thus occurred the first administrative change of the year.

The question as to the right of the Ministry to a dissolution, and the wisdom of Sir W. Stawell in refusing it, has been the subject of much discussion; and the members of the free-trade party who voted with the Opposition have been the object of, as it seems to us, much unmerited reproach for their action.

An equally important question, and one which has been almost overlooked, relates to the propriety of a Ministry resigning under the circumstances we have mentioned. It is generally assumed that an Administration is justified in making any vote a test one, and requiring their followers under pain of possibly throwing the country into confusion to support them in every detail of their measures. This is very different from the views held by the most eminent English politicians. In their opinion, it is as incumbent on retiring Ministers to prove to Parliament and the country that they have unanswerable reasons for resigning their offices as it is for the incoming Ministry to justify themselves on the ground of the public welfare for taking office. Thus Sir Robert Peel, speaking of his own resignation in 1846, expressed a strong opinion that a Minister taking office incurs an obligation to persevere in the administration of his department as long as it is possible for him to do so consistently with his honour, and observed that no indifference to public life, no disgust with its labours, and no personal mortifications could justify a public man in resigning his office; and Earl Russell, in 1841, contended that isolated defeats of a Government, although on questions of grave importance, do not involve the necessity for a resignation, and adduced numerous instances in support of this view.

This theory as to the obligations of Ministers is especially true in regard to their financial proposals, and we accordingly find that on many occasions Governments have withdrawn their budgets and introduced new ones, and have accepted amendments which have almost altered the complexion of their measures. In fact, as the same authority we have already referred to (Earl Russell) observes, "questions of taxation and burdens are questions upon which the House has peculiar claims to have its opinions listened to, and upon which the Executive Government may very fairly, without any loss to its dignity, reconsider any particular measures of finance they have proposed." The discussion which arose on the rejection, by the Lords, of the bill for repealing the paper duties in 1861 will be found very instructive on this point.

We have not space to do more than remind our readers, in confirmation of these views, how, as lately as 1869, Mr. Lowe was compelled, in deference to the opinion of the House of Commons, to give up the duty on matches; how, in 1853, Lord Aberdeen's Ministry had to withdraw their proposal to tax advertisements; and how, in 1848, the same Government had to give up their measure for increasing the income tax. In none of these cases did any change of Ministry follow the amendment in the Government scheme.

If this opinion be correct, it follows that the Kerferd Ministry and not any section of the Opposition are responsible for the confusion and stoppage of legislation which have followed their retirement from office. Not merely did they resign without being actually defeated, but their general policy had a few days previously been approved by a considerable majority in the House. Even this statement does not adequately represent the case. The Treasurer had courted defeat by placing first a proposal which seriously affected an important vested interest, and which it was known that several of the Ministerial supporters were bound to oppose under pain of jeopardising their seats at the next election; yet on this very proposal the Government just escaped defeat. No doubt a succession of such victories would be equivalent to a defeat, but it was the duty of the Ministry not to anticipate events, and to wait until they were beaten on a part of their financial scheme involving an important principle, such as the taxation of land or the remission of customs duties. It seems to us that the Assembly exercised a perfectly legitimate right of criticism when it gave such a hesitating support to this particular detail of the Government scheme. The resignation of the Kerferd Ministry is a striking instance of the effect of copying the form of English parliamentary government without understanding its spirit.

It will follow from the considerations we have mentioned that the Ministry had not felt themselves in a position to ask with any show of reason for a dissolution, and the Acting-Governor could not act otherwise than he did in refusing it.

If the resignation of the Kerferd Cabinet was a violation of true constitutional practice, the acceptance of office by Mr. Berry and his colleagues showed a still greater disregard of the principles which have hitherto ruled the formation of Her Majesty's Ministries both in Great Britain and the colonies. According to these principles, no public man is justified in taking office unless he can obtain as colleagues members who have already had official experience, or whose position in the House and professional standing give assurance of their competence to administer their several departments; and where the outgoing Ministry has been defeated by a coalition, it is also necessary that promises of support and compensation from the several sections of the coalition be obtained. Of both these principles the formation of the Berry Ministry is the most conspicuous violation. Only two of the Premier's colleagues had held office before; none of them occupied a leading position in the House, or had any professional standing; for the first time in our annals a Ministry faced Parliament without a law officer on the Treasury benches, and with a dismissed public servant in charge of one of the largest public departments. And as Mr. Berry failed to obtain the co-operation of colleagues of proved ability and character, so he had equally failed in securing the support of any but the extreme protectionist section of the House. He admitted that he had communicated with four members only besides his colleagues; he had therefore not the slightest reason for supposing that the several sections of the Opposition would give him any support.

On the 9th September the new Ministry met the House, and on the 14th September Mr. Berry made his financial statement; his proposals had the one merit of simplicity, being to raise all the additional revenue by a tax on country land and succession duties; the former tax being imposed not only for revenue purposes, but with the object of causing the sub-division of large estates—a novel application of the theory of Government interference with the natural laws regulating the distribution of wealth. On the 10th September Sir James M'Culloch proposed an amendment, affirming that the burden of supporting Government should be borne by all descriptions of property, and that the imposition of a land tax should be accompanied by a remission of customs duties. A small section of the House appeared, however, to desire to oust the Government from office without committing itself to any policy of its own; and to carry out this object, on the 23rd September Mr. Stewart, a member who had hitherto remained in respectable obscurity, proposed another amendment, affirming simply that the Government proposals were unsatisfactory; this cabal was fortunately, however, defeated, and after another unsuccessful diversion in favor of the Government, made by Mr. Casey, Sir James M'Culloch's amendment was carried by 39 to 34.

On the 12th October Mr. Berry announced that, having asked for a dissolution and been refused it, he had placed the resignations of himself and colleagues in the hands of the Governor. The only important administrative act of this Ministry was the publication of a revised railway traffic tariff, which the officials of the department consider will cause a loss of some £50,000 per annum to the income from this source; it seems, however, impossible, owing to the absence of proper traffic statistics, to do more than guess at the result of the change, and the present Ministry have shown no intention of repealing the new regulations.

On the 20th October the Assembly was informed that Sir James M'Culloch had formed a Ministry, and the House adjourned for four weeks.

The new Government may be described as a coalition between the late Kerferd Administration, which is represented by four Ministers, the moderate protectionists, represented by the Premier, and a section of the free traders, represented by the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Railways. The two last named lost their seats on presenting themselves for re-election; but this result cannot be deemed of much significance, as Dr. Madden was defeated by a gentleman who had represented the constituency for many years previously, and whose defeat at the last general election was probably due to the fact that there were four candidates for the three seats. The defeat of the Minister of Railways may be accounted for by the fact that suspicions were raised as to his soundness on the Education question, and that his colleague exerted his influence for his opponent. Ballarat, moreover, has been always noted for its political eccentricities.

It is a matter for regret that on the meeting of the House more explicit explanations were not given of the reasons which had induced the several members of the Ministry to unite themselves under Sir James M'Culloch. It is the custom in England for Parliament to be fully informed of the negotiations which have led to the formation of a Ministry, and of the reasons for the exclusion from the Cabinet of any prominent member of the party, and this is especially the practice where Ministers have previously sat on opposite sides of the Speaker. The House was moreover entitled to be informed whether any overtures had been made to such prominent members as Messrs. Service, Casey, Murray Smith, and Langton; what promises of support had been given them, and what conditions (if any) had been made. We would refer in support of this statement to the debate which occurred in December 1852, on the formation of the Aberdeen Ministry; and again in February, 1855, on the negotiations which led to Lord Palmerston's taking office. As Lord Derby affirmed—"It is the duty of every public man, whether he accepts or whether he abstains from accepting office, to be prepared to give at the proper time a full explanation both to his own friends and to the country, of the motives which may have induced him so to accept or abstain." Mr. Service pointed this out with much effect in perhaps the ablest speech of the session. It is true that when thus twitted with their silence, several members of the Ministry endeavoured to justify themselves, but the justification was merely an appeal to the necessity for turning out the Berry Ministry and forming another of some sort, while the explanations that are really required in such a case relate to the reasons which induce a public man to undertake to work with others whom he has previously opposed on important questions of public policy, and should contain a statement of how much of his conviction he has consented to give up, and in return for what concession; what questions are to be regarded as open, and what as Ministerial. We are far from saying that no justification can be given for a coalition like that of Sir J. M'Culloch and his colleagues; we are merely drawing attention to the fact that no proper explanation was given, and that the neglect of the practice may lead to serious evil. If it comes to be considered legitimate to form a Ministry by the association of eight or nine members irrespective of the views they hold, or the abilities they possess, or the political party they have been identified with, simply because each of them has two or three fellow members whose votes he can control, we shall have travelled a long way towards the formation of Ministries by ballot or by rotation, when it will be held that a seat on the Treasury benches is simply a snug appointment which is the legitimate perquisite of every member in turn, as the mayoralty is now considered in our Town Council.

On the 23rd November Sir J. M'Culloch made his financial statement—the third of the year. His proposals are very similar to those of Mr. Service, and might well have been dealt with as amendments on those proposals; his property tax may be considered an improvement on that of the member for Maldon, as valuation instead of acreage is taken as the basis. His customs remissions are not so valuable, and do not embody the important principle of reducing protective duties with a view to their ultimately becoming revenue duties simply.

The distinctive feature of Sir James M'Culloch's financial scheme is the imposition of an income tax; even this however seems, from some remarks made during the debate, to have been at one time contemplated by the Kerferd Cabinet.

At the date of writing, the Treasurer's first resolution has been affirmed by a decisive majority; but the late Ministry have declared their intention of stopping all public business until the constituencies have had an opportunity of expressing their views.

Their position, that before a change in the mode of taxation is made, the voice of the constituencies should be heard, is, we need scarcely say, quite untenable—quite opposed to the theory of representative government. The representative is the general agent of his constituency, appointed not to perform one or two particular acts or to obtain some paltry subsidy, but to advise according to his best judgment for the national interests in all circumstances, however unforeseen at the time of his election.

Accordingly we find that it was not considered necessary to dissolve Parliament to obtain the opinion of the nation on such large matters as the union of England and Scotland, of Great Britain and Ireland, or the Repeal of the Corn Laws; and to come to this colony, did Mr. Berry and his party think the opinion of the country should have been specially invited on the question of payment of members—a question not of money merely, but of public policy?

There is no doubt that the Opposition, if they choose to speak to every resolution and to oppose at every stage the various bills which will be required to give effect to the proposed taxation, can, even without using the forms of the House, delay public business to a very inconvenient extent, and possibly compel Sir J. M'Culloch to dissolve Parliament. The Opposition, however, will so act at their peril; and if the Ministry exercise sound discretion and patience, showing the country that their sole desire is to obtain the requisite ways and means, and to pass necessary legislation, we can hardly doubt the result of the contest.

The constituencies, we may trust, will feel that it is not a question whether Sir J. M'Culloch or Mr. Berry shall occupy the Treasury benches; nor even whether we shall have an unjust and burdensome, or an equitable system of taxation—but whether Parliamentary Government itself is to be a failure, whether we are to prove ourselves so wanting in British love of fair play, respect for precedent, and love of order, that a constitution formed for Englishmen becomes unworkable.

The answer then to the questions raised at the commencement of this paper must await the decision of the country. Though we have had to condemn the action of each Ministry we have passed in review, we may hope that the errors we have remarked have been due to ignorance of rather than wilful disregard for the obligations which devolve on public men, and that the unfortunate results may serve as a warning in the future.

The year will not have been lost if constituencies learn that it is not enough for a public man that he is a successful tradesman, an industrious borough councillor, a ready speaker at local meetings, and even a liberal supporter of local charities; that he can obtain a bridge over that river, or a post-office at that township; if they learn that in order that the public credit may be sustained, public works of utility carried out, and necessary legislation accomplished, men are required who have had special professional training or have been practised in large financial transactions, who have been able to conduct their own business without failure and without reproach, who are too high-spirited to be returned as mere delegates and land-jobbers, too high-principled to weigh for a moment the pleasures of office against their settled convictions, and too conscientious to abandon office because a pet measure has been rejected, or because official labours have become irksome.

We find that our review of matters political has occupied so large a space that we cannot on this occasion carry out our intention of remarking on the social and domestic occurrences of the year. In future numbers, when the period under review will be shorter, it will be our endeavour to give due prominence to the public events of whatever kind that have occurred during the quarter.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

"'Twixt Shadow and Shine"—A Story of Christmas, by Marcus Clarke. George Robertson, Melbourne.

We doubt if any Christmas Stories now being published will equal two at least of those published in the metropolis of Victoria. We are certain none will excel Mr. Marcus Clarke's "'Twixt Shadow and Shine." The scene is local, the plot simple, the action dramatic, the characters are individualised, and the language is epigrammatic. It may appear to some that the sayings and doings of the characters introduced are exaggerated. But business and professional men quitting the city for a holiday in the country allow their idiosyncrasies full play. O'Gorman, Jerke, Scrimminger, and Churchill at their business in the city would be staid and prosaic. The same persons out for a holiday excursion would be totally different. Their tendencies pent up in the city would have full play given to them in the country. In this aspect the characters speak and act naturally under the circumstances in which they are placed. We venture to predict a single edition of "'Twixt Shadow and Shine" will be found insufficient to satisfy the reading public of Victoria.

"On the Cards," or a Motley Pack, by Garnet Walch; illustrated by Geo. Gordon M'Crae. F. F. Bailliere, Melbourne.

Another recent Melbourne publication is the Christmas Story by Mr. Garnet Walch entitled "On the Cards." It is an original story in prose, interspersed with verses, and its author may be congratulated on the production of one of the best books of the kind yet published in Victoria. "On the Cards" is well written, the verses and parodies are extremely humorous, and though the comic element is the more prominent, there are one or two touches of genuine pathos. We seem to recognise in some of the characters certain Melbourne celebrities, which fact, while it may heighten the interest to those who are personally acquainted with the originals, does not lessen the intrinsic merit of the story. Mr. Walch has also introduced us to sundry supernatural beings, who pass their lives in a very jocose manner, and freely indulge in a strong propensity for punning, comic singing, and rope-walking. These phenomena should certainly be investigated by such as are interested in the conditions of spirit existence. It remains to say that Mr. George Gordon M'Crae by his excellent illustrations, which are a prominent feature of the book, has ably seconded Mr. Walch in his effort to satisfy the popular craving for fun and fancy. "On the Cards" deserves to be highly successful, and we think that Mr. Walch will have no cause to regret his latest venture.

THE

MELBOURNE REVIEW.

THE EUROPEAN SITUATION.

THE Eastern Question is rapidly ripening to a solution of some sort or other, and what that solution is likely to be is, of all others, the business which at the present time most deeply engages the attention of the diplomatists of Europe. Of all the great Powers of the world there is not one, except the United States, which has not a strong interest in the settlement of this great question. It is a "burning question" to three of the great Powers of Europe—Russia, Austria, and Great Britain; and to other two, Germany and France, it is of hardly less consequence—if not directly—through the possible alliances, which are dependent upon the settlement of a question of such magnitude. Italy—the sixth great power—and Spain, from their position as Mediterranean States, cannot but attach great importance to the question of the possession of the Bosporus; and even China, remote and isolated as it may seem, is brought within the range of the struggle. For if Russia should be allowed to seize and hold Turkey, the effects would ere long be felt throughout Asia to the shores of the Pacific. In fact, it may safely be said that in the field of high politics, the Eastern Question, as it is termed, is now the question of questions; and upon it for some time to come the politics of the civilised world will necessarily hinge.

What then is The Eastern Question? In a few words, it may be said to be, "What State or States shall have the reversion of Turkey, when that "sick" power dies a natural death, or gets knocked on the head by one or more of its neighbours. Only two of the great European powers lie contiguous to it, and these touch it on its northern boundary: Russia on the north-east, and Austria on the north and north-west. Were there no other Powers interested in the matter, it would seem natural enough that if the Turks were driven out of Europe, their territory on that continent should fall as a matter of course to their two northern neighbours, Russia obtaining the eastern half, and Austria the western one. But the geographical position of Turkey is too important, and its natural resources are too great, to permit of its dismemberment being disposed of in so simple a manner. In the first place, Russia deems herself the national heir to the territory of the "Sick Man," and has for the last half century at least, either directly or indirectly, assumed such a position in the eyes of Europe. Nor has she done so without reason. Her great power and influence in Eastern Europe; her previous acquisitions of Turkish territory, both in Europe and in Asia; and above all, the influence she can wield over the Christian populations of Turkey, through their community with her, of race and religion, at once mark her as being the most likely of all the European Powers to absorb Turkey, when Turkey is ripe for absorption. Russia possesses a population double that of Austria, and also much more homogeneous; and though with Turkey as the objective point, Austria has a strategic position infinitely superior to Russia, there can be no doubt, I think, that were the possession of Turkey to be contended for by these two Powers alone, the superior weight and homogeneity of Russia would in the end give her the victory.

But as I have said, Turkey holds too important a position in the world to be left as a mere tit-bit to be swallowed by her northern neighbours, when they deem her ripe for absorption. Her disposal is not simply a question affecting Eastern Europe, but one of world-wide interest and importance. As a seat of empire, her position is not excelled by that of any other country in the world. To Europe she holds the gate of the East; and to Asia, she holds the gate of the West. An imperial race firmly seated in Turkey, and numbering thirty or forty millions—a population she is quite able to sustain, were she properly governed—would undoubtedly be one of the leading nations of the world. The career of the Ottomans themselves, and the great part they have played in history, are sufficient illustrations of such a statement. Inferior, in my opinion, to several other Asiatic tribes or races, and by no means pre-eminent in point of numbers, they at one time ruled over Eastern Asia, Northern Africa, and the best portions of South-eastern Europe, while their fleets swept the Mediterranean, and carried terror into every Christian parish that lined its shores. Indeed at one period of the sixteenth century, the Ottoman power was the most formidable in Europe, and probably in the world. This pre-eminence, I need hardly say, has long since disappeared, partly owing to the absolute decadence of the Turkish power, and partly owing to the greater relative progress of other European states. But the commanding position of Turkey as a seat of empire still remains, and since the opening of the Suez Canal may be said to have become even of greater importance. The strength of a fortress depends largely on its garrison. Gibraltar in the hands of modern Moors would be little better than an African sentinel posted on a European promontory; garrisoned by British troops, it is one of the most famous strongholds of the world. So with Turkey. Held as now by the Ottomans, a people whose race is run, whose development has long since reached its prime, and who are surrounded by a tributary population differing in religion and in descent, and in number exceeding them threefold, Turkey in Europe is at present little more than what Italy was said to be before '59—a mere geographical expression. But though weakly held, the natural strength of the position still exists. Let a Russian garrison replace the Turkish one. Let the Russians obtain Constantinople, and the rule of the Czar extend from the White Sea to the Dardanelles! That would be an acquisition of power, involving momentous results, not only to Britain, but more or less to every power in Europe and Asia. Let me follow up this aspect of the question, and perhaps my readers will then more readily comprehend the importance of the Eastern Question, and the reason why European diplomatists have for far more than half a century watched its development with such intense interest.

Though the most extensive and the most populous country in Europe, and under the rule of a race of monarchs full of ambition, Russia has never yet been unmistakably the leading power in Europe, the revolutionary period of 1848–9 perhaps excepted, when the other great Continental powers being convulsed by internal dissension, she, by their retrogression, became for a short time the principal power on the Continent. But this position was a mere accident, and was quickly lost. The reasons for this are not far to seek. National importance, regarded from our present point of view, arises mainly from the power of offence, not from the power of defence. But as an offensive power, Russia has never been in the first rank among European states. She is too heavily fettered by her geographical position. Practically the ocean is only accessible to her fleets through the Sound and the Dardanelles: sea-passages which such a naval power as Britain can at any time close against her like the gates of a dock. On her western frontier, she has certainly opposite her a flat and open country; but eastern Prussia is thinly peopled and sterile, and a Russian army would have to cross the Oder before it could inflict on Germany any serious blow. But to attempt to cross the Oder with hostile intent to Germany, was even in the young days of Prussia a most formidable undertaking for Russia; and is now, without allies, an impossibility. Austria, her other neighbour on the west, is strongly protected by the barrier of the Carpathians; and Sweden is practically inaccessible except by sea; so that the only European country easily accessible to Russian armies is Turkey. Even against Turkey, though her Moldavian frontier is flat and open, Russia is helpless, unless Austria is either assisting or quiescent; for a glance at the map will show that the Austrian frontier, with the Carpathian range as its boundary, projects towards the Black Sea like a bastion, leaving only a narrow strip of flat country through which a Russian army invading Turkey can march. Unless Russia, therefore, were to procure the assent of Austria, or overcome her resistance, she cannot invade Turkey by land; for an Austrian army in Transylvania could, in less than a fortnight, destroy her line of communication, and paralyse her attack. Though admirably situated for defence, it is clear, from the description here given of her position, that Russia is more powerless for offence in Europe than any other one of the Great Powers. Her position to the other Continental powers is like that of a bear in a pit: a most formidable antagonist to any one who is foolhardy enough to attack her in her own territory; but if without allies, by no means formidable when she attempts to become the aggressor. The character of her people combines with her isolated situation to give her this character. They are obedient, and are thus highly capable of discipline, or at least of drill; tenacious of purpose, and are thus admirable in defence; and are moreover brave to a degree. But they are stolid in intellect, slow in movement—the Cossacks excepted—and have little or no enthusiasm, except of the dullest and most slow-burning kind. Of European nations, they seem to be the very opposite of the French; and Nelson, with the intuition of genius, admirably hit off or implied the different characters of the two nations, when, in a tactical discussion, he said to his commanders—"Lay yourselves alongside a Frenchman, but outmanœuvre a Russian."

Such then, is the geographical, or rather strategical position of Russia, and such the character of her people; and we have now to consider the consequences likely to result to her and to her neighbours, were she to be successful in her long entertained desire to get possession of Turkey, with Constantinople as her southern capital. This, she can only do, as we have seen, with the consent or the connivance of Austria, obtained either by force or by the allowance of some ample consideration. Turkey has a population of about fifteen millions, of whom only between two and three millions are Ottomans. Of these, a large number would no doubt migrate to Asia Minor, were Russia to subdue and get possession of Turkey. Assuming that some of the north-western provinces were ceded to Austria, as her share of the plunder—a sop with which she would probably be compelled to content herself, were she left to oppose Russia, unaided by Germany or Britain—there would still remain, say ten millions of people to be added to the 70 millions of Russia in Europe. Of these ten millions, between seven and eight millions belong to the Greek Church; and as they have been hitherto sorely oppressed by their Turkish rulers, they would naturally regard the Russians as their deliverers, and would join them with a faith, fervent and inflamed by political passion. These Christians of Turkey are moreover a lively vigorous race; sadly wanting at present in all the higher developments of European civilisation, as might be expected from the brutal oppression to which they have for two or three centuries been subjected. They are, nevertheless, highly capable of improvement, and as a race are probably greatly superior to the stolid and ignorant Muscovite. Once thoroughly incorporated with Russia, they would add greatly to the military strength of that empire, as they would supply a great number of fighting men, possessing largely those qualities which I have described the Russian soldiers as lacking. If to the Russian army, which now so largely possesses the high military quality of tenacity, were added a large contingent, drawn from a brave, active, and vigorous race, such as the Wallachians, the Bulgarians and the Serbs; and influenced, probably for some generations at least, with religious enthusiasm, there can, I think, be little doubt that that army would then become a much more formidable national weapon than it has hitherto been. It would, in these Danubian soldiery, acquire an arm that would probably be to the Russian infantry what the Cossacks have been to the regular cavalry; and I am greatly mistaken if to such an addition to the Russian military power competent judges would not attach considerable importance.

But it is not the mere addition to her military strength that Russia would thus receive by the acquisition of Turkey, which causes anxiety to the other powers of Europe. That is merely a minor count in the indictment. Ever since Russia became one of the great Powers she has been able to summon more men to her standard from her own territory than any other nation in Europe; but the geographical drawbacks of her position rendered them comparatively harmless, so long as the poverty of her resources or the want of allies prevented her from carrying out a vigorous offensive campaign. On these points I have already dwelt pretty fully. But let Russia obtain uncontrolled possession of Turkey, and get it once thoroughly incorporated as part of her empire, with a Grand Duke holding vice-regal sway at Constantinople. She would then hold, instead of the worst geographical position in Europe, one of the best in the world. She has already crossed the Caucasus, and holds a considerable territory beyond that range of mountains; and once firmly seated at Constantinople, Turkey in Asia, or at least all the provinces bordering on the Black Sea, would quickly, and as a matter of course, fall under her sway. There are no intrinsic elements of strength in Turkey in Asia that could withstand the advance of any strong European power that had got firm hold of Turkey in Europe. And as against Russia, that could and would press on from the east as well as from the west, and could operate vigorously also from the seaboard, the contest would be utterly hopeless. Thus the possession of Turkey in Europe by Russia, means also the possession of Turkey in Asia. The one would follow the other as a matter of course; and if the intervention of the other European powers were withheld in the first case, they would not be likely to move in the second. If they did, they could only do so under greater disadvantages than in the first; as the possession of Constantinople would give to Russia an immense advantage in a contest for Asia Minor. It is obvious then that unless the other European powers are prepared to allow Russia to occupy not only Turkey in Europe, but the whole of the Asiatic territories of the "Sick Man"—those in Arabia perhaps excepted—they must make up their minds to oppose her to the death in the initiatory advance on Constantinople. There is no reason to believe that at present the Christian inhabitants of Turkey have any ardent love for Russia. It is well known that Muscovite agents have spared no pains for the last half century to induce the oppressed subject populations of Turkey to look to the Czar as their deliverer; but the Crimean war and the active intervention of the other great powers at various times as between Turkey and Russia, have counteracted the intrigues, by showing that there are other Christian powers behind the Turks, to whom even Russia must yield. There can be little doubt then that the attitude of the Christians in Turkey is one of expectancy. They look to Russia or to the other great powers to deliver them, sooner or later, from their Turkish oppressors, whose rule is hateful, not only because of the difference in religion, but because of the difference in the nature of the two forms of civilisation—the Oriental and the European—which in Turkey meet and contend for mastery. Should the desire felt by Russia to obtain the possession of Turkey lead to war, and should the other European powers stand aloof, the natural result will inevitably be, that the Christians in Turkey will regard Russia as their deliverer, and will give her their sympathy, if not their support, against the Turks, and then when Russia succeeds, will naturally accept her as their sovereign state; and if time be given to her to organise a civil government, will fight for her against all comers, even against those powers whom *now* they regard as their friends. This will be their policy and their future action, there can be no reasonable doubt. But it will be a policy forced on them by the course of events, and not the policy of their choice. That choice will naturally be for independence, or semi-independence; for a Danubian Confederation under the protection of Austria, or a syndicate of the great powers; and this indeed seems to be the safest solution of the very difficult question.

It is thus pretty evident that if, when the struggle begins between Turkey and Russia, the other great powers stand aside, and allow Russia to shape the course of events in the Danubian peninsula, according to her own interests, they will not afterwards be able to alter their policy, except at an enormous additional cost. If they intervene—not in favour of Turkey, as has hitherto been the mistaken course of action—but to secure a settlement of the question in favour of the public interests of Europe, they will have the sympathy, and probably also the active support of a large portion of the Danubian Christians. But if from jealousy, timidity, or divided counsels, they permit Russia to carry out her designs, seize Turkey, and incorporate it as part of her huge empire, they will find that to dislodge her from such a position will be a task infinitely more difficult than it would have been in the first instance to defend Turkey against her attack. In the latter case, they would probably have the aid of the Danubian population; in the former they would almost to a certainty, as I have stated, have their more or less active antagonism.

But why should the great powers interfere to prevent Russia from seizing Turkey? That is a question which includes the whole subject, and which my previous remarks will I trust make it somewhat more easy for me to answer. The great powers, other than Russia, which are chiefly interested, are Great Britain, Germany, France, and Austria. All these powers are of course interested in a general sense, in preventing Russia, a state already so great, from acquiring so important an addition to her resources, and above all, to her position as an offensive power, as the possession of Turkey would undoubtedly be. But all these powers are not interested alike. To France especially, now that she has been deposed from her high place in Europe, the aggrandisement of a state so remote as Russia is a matter of comparative indifference compared with the re-conquest from Germany of Alsace and Lorraine. To secure that end, there can be little doubt that France would not only be willing to allow Russia to carry out her own policy beyond the Danube, but would even aid her in the attempt. To make the Rhine once more a French, or a semi-French river, is to every Frenchman a matter of infinitely greater importance than to fulfil the Napoleonic idea of making the Mediterranean a French lake. To secure her former frontier on the upper Rhine, France would willingly permit Russia to obtain the command of the Levant. In preventing the designs of Russia, France cannot therefore be reckoned upon. On the contrary, her alliance with Russia in the struggle is I believe merely a matter of arrangement. Germany is placed in a somewhat difficult position. The incorporation of Turkey with Russia would be to her a far more serious matter than to France; for Russia is her immediate neighbour, and her eastern frontier is peculiarly open and exposed. Then the Danube as an outlet for trade would be entirely in the hands of Russia; for she would have the entire command of its mouth, and the Black sea would be strictly a Russian lake, surrounded as it then would be on all sides by Russian territory. To Germany, these would be considerations of considerable importance. Further, if Turkey became Russian territory, the position of Austro-Hungary would become seriously endangered; and though Germany would in one sense gain by the weakening, or the breaking-up of Austria, yet there can be little doubt, that such gain would be more than counterbalanced by the great aggrandisement of Russia. That power and France would then probably be more than a match for Germany, if she were left without allies. On the whole, then, there can be little doubt that Germany would not under any circumstances consent to Russia obtaining the whole of Turkey. If left unsupported by Britain, she would probably agree that Russia should obtain a considerable portion of the Turkish territory, in order to prevent the threatened alliance of Russia with France, that would otherwise follow. But if Germany agreed to such a partition, she would take care that Austro-Hungary should at the same time receive such a share of the Turkish territory as would render her a formidable rival to Russia in the Danubian peninsula. To secure her position in Danubia, the alliance of Germany would then be absolutely necessary to Austria; so that if France bade high for the Russian alliance, and was able to secure it in a war for the recovery of Alsace and Lorraine, Germany would be able to command the support of Austria, and would thus make her position comparatively safe.

To Austria the disposal of Turkey is a momentous question. Seriously weakened as she has been by her loss of power in Germany, consequent on the aggrandisement of Prussia, the seizure of Turkey by Russia would probably be to her a fatal blow. The Slavic races form about one half of her population, and these have no great liking or affinity for the German element of the empire, which is the ruling power. Hungary has succeeded in obtaining a semi-independent government; but though this concession may have been pleasing to the Magyars, it has in all likelihood only weakened the tie which bound the other more Slavic provinces to the government of the empire. In the southern provinces, especially, where the bulk of the people are Slaves, the rise of another great power to the south would in time probably exercise a strong attraction; for to these provinces the chief political attraction of Vienna has hitherto been that *there* a strong government existed; while to the south lay, if not anarchy, at least the worst government in Europe. So long as the Turks hold sway in the country to the south of the Save, Austria could have little fear for the loyalty of her southern population. She might misgovern and oppress them grievously, but the very worst of Austrian misgovernment was after all better and more endurable than the best of Turkish rule. The hand of Austria fell more lightly than did the little finger of the Turk. All this would be changed, were the Russians absolute or even partial rulers of Turkey. Whatever may be the faults of the Russians, they know full well the benefits of a stable and regular government, and of a fixed system of taxation. A Russian Emperor, or even a Grand Duke holding his court at Constantinople, would in the course of time become, to the population of Southern Austria and Southern Hungary, a political luminary, exercising as great an attraction as the Austrian Emperor at Vienna. Austria would then be, even more than now, in danger of disintegration; for while her motley southern population would be exposed to the new attractions of race and religion at Constantinople, the weakness that would thus be engendered in the empire would cause her German population—the chief strength of the state—to look with still more wistful eyes to Berlin.

In one of Mr. Disraeli's epigrammatic orations, he declared that as regarded foreign politics, England was more an Asiatic power than a European one; and this utterance of the present Prime Minister has often been made use of by the Peace party in the mother country in support of their theory of non-intervention in the affairs of Europe. But it is entirely owing to her being a great Asiatic power that the interest of Great Britain in the Eastern Question is so serious. It may now with truth be said, paradoxical as it may seem, that that country in Europe which is the most remote from the shores of Great Britain is the one of all the European states in whose political future the British people is at present the most deeply interested. The neutrality or the independence of Belgium was deemed by British statesmen, only a few years ago, a matter of such serious importance that, for the purpose of defending it, they were prepared to risk a Continental war. But whether publicly recognised or not, there can I think be little doubt that since the downfall of France, and the rise of Germany, the neutrality of Belgium is to Great Britain a question of but secondary importance. It was only through the restless aggressiveness of France that Belgium was likely to have become a point of attack on England; and French aggressiveness has now got other and newer bones to gnaw. So long as Metz and Strasburg are in German hands, there is little fear of a French army occupying Antwerp. The danger of a French invasion of England, with Antwerp as its base of operations, is a danger of the past; but the danger of a Russian attack on the British line of communication with India is one of the present, or at least of the near future; and it is this danger which makes the Eastern Question—from the insular British view, apparently a remote and shadowy difficulty—in reality one of pressing and momentous importance to the British Empire. Except Austria, to which the preservation of Turkey from Russia may be said to be a matter of life and death, there is no country in the world to which it is of higher interest than it is to England.

The great and only rival of Britain in Asia is now Russia. In the middle of the last century France made a bold attempt for supremacy in India, but Clive broke her power, and, except in Cochin China, she has now hardly more than a foothold in the East. Russia, on the contrary, has for a century made a steady advance. She has for some time been pressing on the northern portion of China; Persia is beginning to feel her touch, even to the east of the Caspian; and in Central Asia her vast conquests during the last few years have been attracting the attention of the whole world. But it has hitherto been the fate of the Russians in Asia, as well as in Europe, to occupy the fag end of the Continent, the sterile and bitter North. To press southwards, and so to remedy the geographical defects of her geographical position in Asia, is with her a desire second only in importance to that of securing a more favorable position in Europe. By many it is thought that India is her real aim. Another, and we think the more correct view, is that her advance towards India is mainly in the way of menace; that she will approach the northern frontier of Hindostan till she is near enough to bring a pressure on the British Government sufficiently strong to make her alliance, or her forbearance in Europe, worth securing. In effect, that her aim is to be able to say to Great Britain, "Leave me alone in Turkey and in Asia Minor to carry out my designs there; and I will leave you alone in India." There is strong presumptive evidence that for the present at least this is the real policy of Russia; and that if Great Britain would permit her to acquire Turkey, she would gladly agree to leave India alone, and sanction the British occupation of Egypt. This was substantially the proposition made by the Emperor Nicholas to Sir Hamilton Seymour before the Crimean war; and there is no reason to suppose that in any material respect the foreign policy of Russia has since then been altered. She is merely now operating over a wider field. It may be said that if these are the terms Russia is willing to offer, why should not Great Britain accept them rather than enter upon a contest, which must be a dreadful one? The answer is plain and direct. Great Britain cannot allow her possession of India to be dependent on the friendship or forbearance of any European power; and the least of all on that of Russia, which is already the only rival power in Asia, and which by the acquisition of Turkey and Turkey in Asia would soon obtain and assume the paramount position on that continent.

The main route from Britain to India is now through Egypt; and as France, for the present at least, has given up all thought of rivalry with Britain in the East, or even in the Mediterranean, that route is now comparatively a safe one. France being quiescent, there is, under present circumstances, no other European power able or likely to disturb or interfere with it. Neither Spain nor Italy are unfriendly; and even if they were, they hardly have the resources that would be required to seriously interfere with the British Indian line of communication. Germany is a natural ally of Britain; and even if she were hostile, she has neither the naval power nor the naval position requisite to make her in this respect a formidable opponent. Russia has a considerable naval force; but, putting the Baltic fleet aside, her ships can only reach the Mediterranean through the Dardanelles. So long then as this passage is held by a power friendly to Britain, or by a power such as Turkey, which is weak enough to be under the tutelage of the Great Powers, the route to India is secure against any serious attack on the part of Russia. For even if Russia were to try to force the passage of the Dardanelles with a fleet and succeeded in doing so, or obtained by coercion the right of passage from Turkey for the purpose of attacking the British line of communication with India, such a mode of attack could never prove really dangerous to Britain, unless Constantinople and the whole of the country bordering on the Dardanelles were at the same time occupied by a strong Russian force. Were this precaution not taken, it might result in the passage of the Dardanelles being seized by a British expedition; and the strait being in this way closed against the retreat of the Russians, they would either have to conquer at sea or surrender at discretion. No Russian government would be foolish enough to risk placing a powerful fleet in such a dangerous position; and unless the attacking fleet were powerful, it would be all but harmless. Practically speaking, then, it is evident that if the Russian fleets are to be effective in the Mediterranean against British interests, Russia herself must hold the Dardanelles. But to hold such a position securely, she must practically have obtained possession of Turkey, or the greater portion of it; and with Turkey conquered, Russia never could and never would rest, till the greater part of Turkey in Asia had also fallen under her sway.

I have already pointed out how the Continental nations of Europe would be affected, were Russia allowed to carry out her schemes of conquest so far as this: and I will now proceed to explain how her success would imperil the position of Great Britain. The Black Sea and the Sea of Marmora would of course become in reality Russian lakes—a gigantic dock and dock-basin as it were—in which not a ship could float without the consent of the Russian Government.

In these secure inland seas, the most formidable naval preparations could be made silently and securely. Ships of all sorts could be built and fitted out; crews could be organised and trained; auxiliary military forces and *materiel* could be safely and secretly got ready; strong places could be fortified as depôts in various parts of Anatolia; and one or two ports in that province or on the Syrian coast might be prepared, either as harbours of refuge, or as supporting strongholds for attack. All these preparations would of course take many years to complete, but were the *position* once secured by Russia, and the immense natural wealth of that portion of the world fully and fairly in her hands, there can be no doubt that such a scheme of preparation and of attack would be quite within her resources; and nothing could prevent her from carrying it out so long as she occupied the territory in question. The main powers of offence of the then huge empire could be concentrated near the sea of Marmora, ready to be directed, when a fitting opportunity occurred, against the neck of the British line of communication with India, viz., Egypt. The power of the British Empire is undoubtedly great, and I by no means wish to underrate it; but in such a struggle as would then arise, I do not see how success could be possible, were Russia persistent in her effort; and her history shows that hardly any country has more tenacity of purpose. The strategic advantages would be all on her side. Her chief naval and military resources would be within three or four days' steaming of the objective point; and a considerable portion on the coast of the Levant probably within 30 or 40 hours. At least half the offensive force of the empire could be placed at this south-western extremity of it, and could be left there ready to move at any time. Doubtless if time were given, so that the naval strength of Britain could be concentrated at Alexandria, a Russian expedition could probably be destroyed before it could effect a landing: but time would not be given. One of the main advantages of Russia in such a struggle would be that, while the natural and central position of her attacking force under ordinary circumstances would be Constantinople, and probably one or two points on the seaboard of Asia Minor, she would thus always be ready for offence. The natural position of the British naval force is of course the English channel. Thus the attacking force would have the terrible advantage of being able to be at the objective point—say Alexandria or Port Said—about ten days before the full strength of the defending force. Either this advantage would have to be given; or the British Government would be compelled to keep constantly, partly at Alexandria, and partly at Malta, a naval force, capable at all critical periods of defending Egypt against a Russian attack. Such a force would require to be necessarily of immense strength—of such a strength, indeed, that in every other part of the world the British power at sea would have to be reduced to a minimum. But such a strain on the resources of the people of the United Kingdom could not be kept up for any length of time. To hold open the route to India through Egypt at such a cost would soon be deemed insupportable, and thus practically in the course of time Egypt would also fall into the hands of the Muscovite.

But it is quite impossible, my readers will say, that all this can happen—that Russia will be permitted to aggrandise herself and step from conquest to conquest in such a terrible fashion. Certainly not. For my own part, I have not the least fear of such a result, for I believe that the imperial spirit is as strong as ever in the hearts of the British people, and if their course of action can only be made clear to them, that they are now as ready and as able to contend with Russia for the Empire of Asia as they were under the elder Pitt to fight with France for supremacy in North America. But what are the steps that should be taken? It seems to be generally admitted now that the Crimean war was a blunder, and that we were inveigled into that struggle to give *eclat* to Louis Napoleon, and the recently established Second Empire. A lively recollection of what that war cost Great Britain in blood and treasure is not likely to induce the British people, except under extreme pressure, readily to entertain the idea of another war in the East. In this lies the danger. If Russia can only make sure that no reason whatever will again cause the British people to go to war on behalf of Turkey, or to prevent Turkey from being seized by the strongest power in its vicinity, then the Russian Government will be relieved of its gravest diplomatic difficulties. Its course will then be clear. It is the British fleet, and the alliances that the British Government can form, that Russia mainly fears. Let it only be distinctly understood that whatever Russia may do in Eastern Europe, the British Government will remain neutral; and it is more than probable that before ten years have gone, Russia will be firmly seated at Constantinople; and ere the century is out, will have strode over Asia Minor and planted her foot firmly in Egypt. There is only one other power that could stay her career of conquest, and that power is one whose interest in doing so would only be indirect. Germany is a great nation, and it is possible that were Great Britain to unseat herself from her pride of place, and become a second Holland —a mere hive of money-getters—Teutonic pride might be stirred, and the task of curbing the Muscovite be undertaken by the German people. But the work could never be effectually done by Germany unaided by a strong maritime power. Besides, the present position of Germany is rather a critical one. France in her wild desire for revenge, and for the recovery of her lost provinces, is keenly seeking for alliances to enable her to obtain them. The power in all Europe most capable of gratifying her wishes in these respects is undoubtedly Russia; and as the French desire for revenge is coincident with the Russian longing for Constantinople, the alliance of the two powers is one of the near probabilities of the future. Indeed it is quite possible that, were Britain entirely neutral, and France wisely led and likely to secure the alliance of Russia and Italy, Germany for her own safety would be compelled to remain neutral as regards the disposal of Turkey; and to secure the neutrality of Russia even countenance her to some extent in her policy of aggression. The alliance of Britain is thus a most important element in the present critical position of continental affairs. She alone among the great Powers is unembarrassed by the active envy or hatred of her neighbours; and thus happily placed, she may be said to hold the key of the European situation. To be entire mistress of the position, she has only to enter into a cordial offensive and defensive alliance with Germany; and this fact is apparent enough to the astute diplomatists of St. Petersburg. They have at present a hold, and a strong hold, on every other one of the Great Powers; and if left to deal with them alone, can to a great extent bend them to the Russian policy. But the interests of Great Britain are at present practically unassailable by Russia; and so long as the latter power does not possess Turkey, are likely so to remain.

It is evident enough from what I have stated that the diplomatists of Europe have at present an uneasy time. In nautical phraseology, their craft is troubled with a cross sea. The effects of the great storm of 1870–71 are still felt in the Continental political waters, which at the same time are beginning to heave and moan under the influence of the premonitory gusts of what promises to be a still greater convulsion. If then we desire a correct forecast of the probable result of the impending storm, we must weigh well the outcome of those that within the last ten years have already passed over Europe. I have already alluded to the general result, but a proper comprehension of the probable course of events in the future compels me, even at the risk of being thought tedious, to deal with the matter more in detail.

A most striking fact in connection with the wars of 1866 and of 1870–71, is that while great and important changes in the relative position of the European powers resulted from those contests, Great Britain was the only power that obtained from them an unalloyed benefit. Previous to 1866, the great strength of the German nation was seriously weakened by the antagonism that existed between Prussia and Austria. This antagonism increased the influence of France on the one side and of Russia on the other, and made France in reality the leading power on the Continent. When Austria was defeated in 1866, and Prussia virtually became the head of the German race, both Russia and France suffered a relative decline in power and influence. The loss to France was obvious, and so chafed upon the fiery temper and impulsive character of her people as to precipitate her into the disastrous war of 1870. The loss to Russia was more indirect, and probably was at first quite unperceived by her imperfectly educated population; who were not likely to comprehend with readiness the idea that Russian power had been lessened because the ungrateful Austrians had been defeated by Prussia. The Russian diplomatists would of course quite comprehend the importance of the event; but, fortunately for Prussia, when the Russian people are not excited—and they are not easily excited—the views of their foreign office may be said to be mainly the views of the Czar and his minister for foreign affairs; and to these two personages, the King of Prussia and his Chancellor were and are *personæ gratæ.* How well, under such circumstances, the then Count Bismarck could soothe and allay any rising uneasiness of the Court of St. Petersburg may be imagined. That it was successfully allayed, and the sympathy and even promised support of Russia obtained by Prussia in her subsequent struggle with France, is well known. But with the wonderful successes of 1870–71, and the acquisition of Alsace and part of Lorraine, there came to Germany great difficulties. By the genius of Bismarck and Moltke, and by the valour of her soldiers, she had obtained the first place in Europe, but by her victory she had excited in France a rancorous desire for revenge, and—to her more serious still—she had by her great success aroused the jealousy of Russia. To the dull and ignorant Muscovite population, Sadowa was but as the victory of a Russian satrap who defended their western frontier against France, their great enemy in

Europe; but Sedan, the capture of Napoleon, and the surrender of Paris—all too without the assistance of a Russian army—were events which could neither be stifled by Russian ignorance nor explained away by Russian self-esteem. There arose feelings of wonder and surprise; and then of fear among the Russian people, that their former humble ally in the west had now become a powerful rival; and the soreness and the jealousy which the French quickly felt against Prussia after Sadowa, the Russians slowly began to feel after Sedan. I believe I am correct in stating that in Russia this feeling has for some years been wide spread and deep seated, and though now restrained by the influence of the Czar and some of his chief councillors, is largely shared in by the Czarowich and many of the nobility, who strongly favor an alliance with France. The position of Germany, with the certain enmity of France and the probable enmity of Russia, is therefore as I have said, if not dangerous, at least critical; and her statesmen, while making every preparation to enable them to contend alone with the united strength of Russia and France, are no doubt most anxious to obtain the assistance of other states, provided such can be got on honourable terms. Thus while the insurrection in the Herzegovina, and the collapse of the finances of Turkey are strongly pressing on the great powers of Europe, the necessity of speedily coming to some definite arrangement as to the settlement of the Turkish difficulty, we find that of the three powers whose duty it is to prevent Russia from carrying out her designs on Constantinople, Great Britain alone is free to deal with the question on its merits. France, that fifteen years ago tried to *pose* as the future mistress of the Mediterranean, and consequently wished to assert the first place in the settlement of the Eastern Question is now comparatively indifferent; her bugbear is now, not Russia, but Germany ; and the turning point of her policy is not who shall obtain Constantinople, but how she can recover Strasburg and Metz. For Russia this is a great gain, as she has only to make up her mind to help France to recover her lost provinces, and perhaps obtain the Rhine as a frontier; and in return France will connive at, if not actively help her in her designs in the East. Austria is, by her geographical position, Russia's most immediate antagonist, and her only possible rival in the claim for suzerainty over Turkey—unless indeed Greece should be elevated to the dignity of an aspirant. But Austria has also been humbled by Prussia; and it may be a question with some of the more short-sighted of Austrian statesmen, whether they should not take advantage of the deadly hatred of France, and the growing antagonism of Russia against Germany, to form a triple alliance, which should have for its objects, to depose Prussia from the leadership of Germany, and again give that position with goodly portions of Prussian territory to Austria; to France, Alsace and Lorraine, and possibly the Rhine as an eastern frontier; and to Russia, the Danubian Provinces, if not the whole of Turkey, which then indeed would be merely a question of time. Such an alliance would have peculiar charms for the reactionary portion of Austrian statesmen; and not less so, I am afraid, for many of the members of the Imperial family. But fortunately for Germany and for Europe, there is not much chance of so wild a policy being adopted. It would be bitterly opposed by the liberal party in Austria, and the Hungarians would regard it almost as equivalent to the dismemberment of the empire; while Great Britain, as in the "Seven Years' War," would of course support Germany to the uttermost. The Court of Vienna then must give up such a vision, if it has ever entertained it, and, though perhaps with a sigh of reluctance, must turn its face to the south, and endeavour to gain empire there, in return for what it has lost in the north. As I have stated, by her geographical position, she is the only one of the Great Powers that can be put forward as the rival of Russia for the possession of Turkey, and in such a case, she must recognise her position, and submit to what, in Yankee phraseology, is her "manifest destiny."

The position of Germany, it is evident, is one of great embarrassment, and had she not at her head the ablest leaders in Europe, might even be said to be one of considerable peril. On her three frontiers, east, south, and west, are the three most powerful states of the Continent; and of these, two within ten years have been humbled by her in the field, and have had to yield to her some of their most cherished heritages. The third, Russia, finds her to be placed by the same great deeds in the position of a great rival, instead of a modest ally. Though the rise of Germany has been for the interests of Great Britain the most happy event that has taken place in Europe since Waterloo, yet we know who sore and how mortified a considerable portion of the British people were at her success; although she long has been, and still is, the natural ally of Great Britain. What then must have been the feelings of animosity excited by the wonderful success of Germany—not in France merely, but in Austria and in Russia. Since the war of 1870–71 the

German statesmen must have had, and must still have, a task of the greatest difficulty to placate their neighbours—to play Austrian ambition against Russian rapacity, and to keep either or both from combining with France. But in playing such a game, Germany has the services of a master of the art; and though the probability is that Russia will be found, when the time comes, to have gained France to her side in her designs against Turkey, there are already visible signs that Austria is on the other side, and that she has cast in her lot with Germany.

In all this varied complication of forces which is now agitating continental Europe, the two most prominent and most powerful states are Russia and Germany; each being the central point in the two separate spheres of action. Should the Turkish question result in war, Russia will be the great aggressor; and should the French, in their desire to avenge Sedan, succeed in obtaining allies, Germany of course will be the main point of attack. The desire of Russia to obtain assistance in her object will lead her to the side of France, and the longing of France for revenge against Germany will cause her to aid Russia. The ambition of Russia is the opportunity of France, and the longing of the French for revenge is the opportunity of Russia. It is the convergence of desire on the part of these two great states that renders the present phase of the Eastern Question probably the most perilous that it has yet seen. Russia is not likely to obtain a position more favourable for attack on Turkey than the one she will occupy when she secures the active assistance of France. The probability then is, that if the Russian Government has made up its mind to run the tremendous risk involved in a war for the possession of Turkey, it will not be much longer delayed. Russia herself is not ready, and France is still less so; but two years, perhaps one year more, of preparation will probably suffice for both; and then in all probability, "the deluge." Diplomacy may in the meantime arrange matters, so that the catastrophe may be averted, or at least postponed; but this is not likely, for it is one of the peculiar dangers of the position, that the question of peace or war is not solely in the hands of one, or even of all the great Powers. At any time, the despair of the Turkish insurgents, or the folly of the Turks themselves, may in a week or two so precipitate matters as to render a general war inevitable. The task of the diplomatists at present is in my opinion most likely to be that of arranging alliances respectively for the attack and for the defence. And this brings me to one of the most important parts of my subject: the probable position in the struggle of Great Britain.

As Mistress of India, Great Britain has responsibilities in connection with the Turkish question, second to no other power in Europe —Austria excepted; and if to this threatened and unnatural alliance of Russia and France, the force of events had brought to her no compensating advantage, her outlook would indeed be unpleasant, if not gloomy. It is a somewhat common belief on the continent of Europe, that England is a favourite of fortune, and that her high position is due more to good luck than to any superior merit of her people. However this may be, it is evident, if we carefully consider the political aspect of the continent, that if in the impending struggle for Turkey, Great Britain shall have to reckon, not merely on the defection of France, but on her enmity, as an ally of Russia, the loss can be more than made good, if the British Government is bold, and is resolutely backed up by the British people. All my preceding remarks have been indeed weak and futile, if I have not made it plain to my readers, that this "Eastern Question" is one of the first importance to the British Empire; a crisis in the course of events, which but rarely comes; and which if not met with that spirit and boldness which in emergency ought to characterise every race that aspires to rule, will end disastrously to the empire. It is one of those high occasions in which bold play is the safest play, and in which timidity and caution lead only to loss and disaster. It is evident from the vast preparations of Germany, as well as from what has leaked out during the last six months, that a Franco-Russian alliance is not only a possibility, but a strong probability; and if the British people do not yet fully comprehend what such an alliance means, the sooner they do so the better. There can indeed, as I think I have already made clear, be only one explanation of it. Russia is to have Turkey, and France is to have the frontier of the Rhine. These, roughly speaking, must be the end and aim of such an alliance. It is a bold game; almost a desperate one. But France is reckless in her rancour; and Russia, generally so cautious, seems to have become reckless in her ambition. The one is burning for revenge; the other is hankering open-mouthed for the sweet morsel of Turkey. Each probably deems the other's desire her own opportunity, which if now let slip is not likely to recur. There is only one thing that can give such an alliance a strong probability of success; and that is, timidity and hesitation in the counsels of Britain. Against such an alliance, Germany will fight to the death; not of course for Turkey, but for her own safety. Austria perforce will be on the same side; not from love of Germany, but because of her own desire for Turkey. If Great Britain timidly holds aloof, and merely assumes the part of an armed neutral, while these mighty combatants are contending for mastery, she will find herself of small account indeed when the terms of peace come to be settled. Nay more. If she holds back in the diplomatic struggle which will inevitably precede the final appeal to arms, and which in all probability is now going on, she may find that even here timidity may be disastrous. Prince Bismarck is not likely to pull the Turkish chestnuts out of the fire for Lord Derby to munch. Should the British Cabinet temporise, and try to throw the whole burden of defending Turkey on Germany and Austria, these two powers will of course look out for themselves, and will naturally consult their own interests only in trying to arrange terms of peace with their powerful opponents. It may be said that the objects of a Franco-Russian alliance are, as I have stated them, of such a nature that it would be impossible for Germany to agree to them. This is, without doubt, true. But if thus left in the lurch by the British Government, Prince Bismarck would not be without his revenge. In fertility of diplomatic resource, he is without an equal among European statesmen; and he who has successively foiled the Austrian, French, and Russian diplomatists, is not likely to be worsted by those of Britain. Having only the interests of Germany and Austria then to consider, his policy towards France and Russia would of course be to seek some mode of gratifying their ambition, while still preserving the interests of Germany and of her ally Austria. Untrammelled by the interests of Great Britain, which of course under such circumstances he would not care to consult, the German Chancellor would probably address Prince Gortchakoff in the following tone, if not strictly in the following terms: "You want Turkey. Good. The disposal of Turkey does not very" "deeply concern Germany; but it is of the highest importance to our" "ally, Austria. Let her be satisfied in the partition, and we will not" "object. Give her, say, Bosnia, Servia, and the north-western pro-" "vinces. Reserve for yourselves Roumania and Bulgaria, leaving the" "navigation of the Danube free to all nations. Make Constantinople" "a free city; or give the provinces south of the Balkan to Greece," "with Constantinople as her capital. Then if *you* wish for further" "empire, why there is the whole of Asia Minor, open to your advance" "from your Trans-Caucasian provinces. Your conquests there will" "not affect us or our ally. England may object, it is true, as she has" "a few millions in the Suez Canal; but German blood shall not be" "shed for stock-jobbers. As for France, your ally, she wants our" "Alsace and Lorraine. Well, no. These are now German, and so they" "shall remain. But there is Belgium. They speak French there, do" "they not? Why then should it not become French? England may" "object again. If she does, let France cede to her Pondicherry! Is" "she not a great Asiatic power? And let me see—if France gets" "Belgium, the independence of Holland would be endangered." "Under such circumstances, I think it would be necessary for us to" "take that country under our protection. In Holland, you are aware," "they speak '*platt Deutsch.*'"

I have put this phase of the question somewhat strongly; but those who have most closely studied the career of "the terrible Chancellor," will, I think, be the most ready to admit that, under the conditions given, the neutrality of Great Britain would be treated by him as caustically and as scornfully as I have here ventured to state. Let us now turn to the other aspect of the question, and consider how a cordial alliance of Britain with Germany would affect the position of affairs. In the first place, any lingering reluctance on the part of Austria to join Germany would be removed, and the strength of Austro-Hungary would be thrown heartily into the movement on Turkey; for success would then be certain. At sea, of course, the British fleet would be triumphant; the Black Sea would be entered by a British squadron—except in the event of a contingency hereafter discussed—and the coasts of Turkey, both in Europe and Asia Minor, would not be liable to attack by Russian expeditions. With a powerful Austrian army in Transylvania, and a British fleet in the Black Sea, the advance of Russia into Turkey would be most hazardous, if not altogether impossible. The population of Danubia would not be under the manipulation of Russia, and would probably soon be organised under Austrian superintendence for defence against Russia. From the Baltic to the Bosporus there would then be an allied power, separating Russia completely from Western Europe, and completely isolating her. With the British navy to back such an alliance, Asia Minor could soon be brought under its influence, and could also be thoroughly protected from Russian encroachment on the side of the Caucasus. Egypt would then be as safe from Russian attack as the Isle of Wight. In fact, so powerful would be the alliance of the three powers—Germany, Austria, and Great Britain—that were it once openly declared by their respective Governments that, in the settlement of the Eastern

Question, they would act strictly in concert, the Franco-Russian alliance would most probably dissolve: for the simple reason that it would be useless. Against such a combination as these three powers, France and Russia would be comparatively helpless. They would not only be largely overmatched in mere military strength; but hopelessly so in strategic advantages. They would be, as it were, in the position of an army whose centre has been pierced. Germany, with Austria supporting her in the south, and Britain on the north, would be able to turn nearly her whole strength against either France or Russia, as she might deem advisable. If she elected to attack France, a Russian advance into Western Germany, as a diversion, would be a most hazardous movement; for Austria would be on one flank, protected by the Carpathian Range, while a British fleet would command the Baltic, and render Dantzig a most formidable place of arms on the other flank. Thus both flanks of a Russian advance would be strongly threatened, and any serious attack on Germany so rendered almost impossible.

On the side of France, again, the great German fortresses—Metz, Coblentz, Mainz, and Strasburg—would thoroughly cripple the movements of a French army of invasion; and thus enable the main German and Austrian armies to attack Russia with overwhelming strength. In fact, so greatly superior would be the forces of the triple alliance, both by land and sea, and so infinitely more advantageous would be its strategic position, that, as I have said, it is questionable whether Russia or France would in the face of such odds dare the risk of war. Thus, a bold and decided policy on the part of Great Britain would probably have the effect of averting war altogether, and be the means of saving Europe from what promises, if once begun, to be one of the most terrible and bloody struggles she has ever witnessed.

There is certainly one contingency which would perhaps considerably influence France and Russia to risk the chances of war; and this from recent indications—certainly not very decided, but still significant—is by no means an improbable one, viz.:—the active alliance with them of Turkey herself. It may appear a most absurd statement to make; but still it seems to me quite within the bounds of probability, that when the struggle comes, the power of the Turks—I mean of the Moslem, not of the Christian races—will be with Russia, and not with the supposed Turkish defender and ally, Britain. But this support of Russia by the Mussulman population would certainly send with decisive ardour to the other side, the whole of the Christian races of Turkey; and as Austria, from her geographical position, could at once communicate with them, and organise their forces, I think it doubtful whether Russia would gain in real strength by the Ottoman support. She would doubtless obtain certain initiatory advantages such as the closing of the Dardanelles to the British fleet; but a vigorous offensive on the part of Britain and her allies would soon compensate for this, and place the result of the struggle, in Europe at least, beyond doubt. In Asia Minor, however, the combination of Russia with the Ottomans would make the contest there a protracted one. But with Turkey in Europe seized and firmly held, the first great step would be gained; and time would certainly tell strongly in favour of Austria and her allies. For while their alliance would be a natural one; that between Russia, France, and the Ottomans would be of an exceptional character, which could not long stand the strain that time would be sure to bring.

My space is necessarily limited, and I must therefore now omit much that might be written relative to the probable policy of an Anglo-German alliance such as I have advocated. In the meantime it is evident that Austrian action relative to Turkey is being supported by the British Government, as against that of Russia; and in all probability, such action is the result of a joint policy. It is not clear, however, that Germany is acting in concert with Austria and Britain; and until a cordial alliance with that great power has been secured, the great danger of the position will not have been removed. There is indeed considerable reason to fear that the well known indisposition of the British Government to interfere in continental politics may lead to such inactivity and irresolution as may prove dangerous. When we reflect on the intimate relations which have so long subsisted between the German and Russian Governments, and on the great service that Russia conferred on Germany by her attitude during the war of 1870-71, it is manifest that Prince Bismarck will not lightly throw over his late ally. He is not one who is likely to be quite "off with the old love, before he is on with the new;" and if Great Britain wishes to secure the thorough support of Germany in the settlement of the Turkish question, she will have to make very decided advances, and speak with no uncertain sound. It is not a policy of "dilly-dally," or "shilly-shally," that will bring to her side the powerful and decisive support of the German people. That will only be obtained by a bold and outspoken line of action, making it clear to the Cabinet of Berlin that Great Britain is prepared to enter into a hearty offensive and defensive alliance with the two great German powers to secure the ends which the three nations have in view. Fortunately the aims of each are not incompatible. Germany wishes to be secure against the threatened alliance of France and Russia. Austria wishes to prevent Russia from obtaining Turkey, and desires for herself, when the Turks are turned out of Europe, as they soon must be, some of the northern provinces, and possibly a suzerain right over the southern part of the kingdom. The aim of Great Britain is to secure her communication with India through Egypt; and, collaterally, to prevent her great Asiatic rival, Russia, from acquiring any further portions of Turkey or of Asia Minor. By supporting the designs of Austria on Turkey as against those of Russia, the object of Britain will be secured in the only way possible for her; but unless the support of Germany is also obtained for the policy of Austria, it will not be possible to carry out such policy in its fullest aim against the opposition of Russia. The alliance with Germany is thus highly desirable, if not absolutely necessary to Great Britain; and it is fortunate for the latter power that the present danger of Germany from the threatened Franco-Russian alliance renders her cordial support obtainable on such easy terms, as say, the continuance of the present position in Western Europe. But the British people are chary of Continental alliances and European entanglements, and I quite admit not without reason. Secure in the strength of their insular position, they do not devote that attention to European politics which the inhabitants of the continental states have to give to them of necessity. Such indifference can be indulged in without much danger to British interests, when the course of events is confined strictly to the affairs of the Continent. But when a question arises, such as this complicated and all important Turkish difficulty, the settlement of which involves, not merely the balance of power in Europe, but the balance of power in Asia, in which Great Britain has a supreme concern, then indifference becomes, not merely culpable, but in the highest degree dangerous to the interests and to the honour of the British Empire.

T. D. WANLISS.

GEORGE ELIOT.

One after another the great masters of fiction have been removed from us by death, and we are obliged to rest with what thankfulness we may on what they have already done, for no longer can they thrill us with emotions of pain or of pleasure by new creations. Thackeray, Dickens and Lord Lytton have passed from us—all died in harness; the first two with promising work begun, and Lord Lytton with one of his finest works all but completed.

And who among the countless swarm of writers, second, third, and fourth rate, can take or keep the place which these masters of fiction have vacated? Never was the mob of gentlemen—and ladies too—who write with ease so numerous as now. Never was there so large an average reading public eager to glance at anything *new*, or so large a critical public, or so high-toned a press capable of appreciating anything *good* as at this time; and yet, with the exception of the remarkable woman who is the subject of this paper, who writes under the *nom de plume* of George Eliot, there is no one, man or woman, who has reached the top rung of the ladder. We have story-writers in abundance, readable enough, but whose tales make no impression, illustrate nothing in the world without us, call out nothing from the world within our own souls. For it is the province of genius, and of genius alone, to call forth a responsive spark from the souls with which it is in communion, either by the spoken voice or through the printed page. Ideas, aspirations, conclusions, which we were before unconscious of, or very dimly conscious of, leap into light before the awakening touch of a higher, yet a kindred soul. And in this faculty I would place George Eliot even above all the great writers whom I have mentioned, that is, if I judge from my own experience. No writer of fiction has called forth such wide sympathies, or has influenced my aims and my conduct as George Eliot has done.

The pathos of Dickens is more moving to the general public, because it deals more with outward conditions, and less with mental and psychic attitudes. His unrestrained and genial humour is more laughter-provoking than her polished epigrammatic wit, or even than Mrs. Poyser's incisive speeches; her wonderful descriptions of commonplace people like Mrs. Glegg and Mrs. Pullet, or Mr. Brooke, have not the charming extravagance of Mrs. Gamp or Mr. Micawber; the satire in Vanity Fair and in the Newcomes is more trenchant than the under-current in Middlemarch; and there are passages of higher poetical beauty in Lord Lytton's works than in those of George Eliot.

But in those points in which women are supposed, and I think rightly so, to be most deficient—in the balance of mind, in the artistic completeness of her work, in the soberness of her estimates, and in the toleration and appreciation of all forms of religion, all forms of art, and all classes and degrees of intellect, George Eliot, in my opinion, stands higher than any novelist living or dead. Especially do we feel this sense of just proportion in the place which she accords to *love* in human life. As the most intense of passions, occurring generally at an age when the feelings are keenest, love is a mighty factor in the problem of life; its influence is great when it is happy, but perhaps greater still when it is disappointed. Still it is very far from being all life, or even any very great part of life; and those novels from female hands, which are so abundant nowadays, in which the three volumes are filled with love quarrels and reconciliations, with alternate bullying and what is popularly called *spooning*, are as false to real life as they are incapable of raising it to ideal heights.

It is, I think, more than seventeen years since I felt that a new star had risen. Side by side in *Blackwood's Magazine* with Bulwer's "What will he do with it?" appeared a new work entitled "Scenes of Clerical Life," and of them "Janet's Repentance" showed unmistakable marks of the keenest worldly shrewdness and the deepest religious insight. The religious revival described as taking place in Milby, under the preaching of Mr. Tryan, an earnest Evangelical Church clergyman, is described as affecting the young ladies thus:—

> "Poor women's hearts! Heaven forbid that I should laugh at you, or make cheap jests on your susceptibility towards the clerical sex, as if it had nothing deeper or more lovely in it than the mere vulgar angling for a husband. Even in these enlightened days, many a curate, who, considered abstractedly, is nothing more than a sleek bimanous animal in a white neckcloth, with views more or less Anglican, and furtively addicted to the flute, is adored by a girl who has coarse brothers, or by a solitary woman, who would like to be a helpmate in good works beyond her own means, simply because he seems to them the model of refinement and of public usefulness. What wonder then that in Milby society, such as I have told you it was, a very long while ago, a zealous evangelical clergyman, aged thirty-three, called forth all the little agitations

which belong to the divine necessity of loving."—*Scenes of Clerical Life and Silas Marner*—208.

And as affecting one, at least, of the old ladies—

"Mrs. Linnett had become a reader of religious books since Mr. Tryan's advent, and as she was in the habit of confining her perusal to the purely secular portions, which bore a very small proportion to the whole, she could make rapid progress through a large number of volumes. On taking up the biography of a celebrated preacher, she immediately turned to the end, to see what disease he died of; and if his legs swelled, as hers occasionally did, she felt a stronger interest in ascertaining any earlier facts in the history of the dropsical divine—whether he had ever fallen off a stage-coach; whether he had married more than one wife, and in general any adventures and repartees recorded of him *previous* to the epoch of his conversion. She then glanced over the letters and diary, and wherever there was a preponderance of Zion, the River of Life, and notes of admiration, she turned over to the next page; but any passage in which she saw such promising nouns as 'small-pox,' 'pony,' or 'boots and shoes,' at once arrested her."—204.

Nevertheless, I quote from my author again—

"Evangelicism had brought into palpable recognition and operation in Milby Society that idea of duty, that recognition of something to be lived for beyond the mere satisfaction of self, which is to the moral life what the addition of a great central ganglion is to animal life."—248.

And again—

"Yes, the movement was good, though it had in it that mixture of folly and evil which makes what is good an offence to feeble and fastidious minds, who want human actions and characters riddled through the sieve of their own ideas, before they can accord their sympathy or admiration. Such minds, I dare say, would have found Mr. Tryan's character very much in want of the riddling process. The blessed work of helping the world forward, happily, does not wait to be done by perfect men, and I should imagine that neither Luther nor John Bunyan, for example, would have satisfied the modern demand for an ideal hero, who believes nothing but what is true, and feels nothing but what is exalted, and does nothing but what is graceful. The real heroes of God's making are very different."—249.

In this passage of her first work, George Eliot strikes the key note of all her subsequent compositions. God working through faulty instruments—struggling souls catching glimpses of light, and inadequately but sincerely revealing them to their fellows. In "A Minor Prophet," one of her last published poems, she rises from a comparatively low key almost to the apotheosis of imperfection, and pities

"Future men who will not know
The pathos exquisite of lovely minds,
Hid in harsh forms."

Jubal and other poems, 199.

Even although

"I too rest in faith
That man's perfection is the crowning flower
Towards which the urgent sap in life's great tree
Is pressing—seen in puny blossoms now,
But in the world's great morrows to expand
With broaded petal and with deepest glow."—200.

And so on to a conclusion, unsurpassed, as I think, in any modern poetry.

"Scenes of Clerical Life" was no ordinary book, and when, some time afterwards, the world rang with the praises of "Adam Bede," the thoughtful reader saw in it only the fuller utterance of the same mind. I never had any doubt that it was written by a woman, although the pseudonym and several touches in the book itself were evidently meant to mislead the public. The subtlety of the descriptions of the character of Dinah Morris, and still more of Hetty Sorel, appeared to me to be beyond the power of man, and the minute knowledge of woman's work and woman's raiment was not likely to be acquired by any but a woman.

Perhaps nothing shows the great strides which women's work has taken more than comparing our own times with those which George Eliot has dealt with in her English novels. I observe that the new work, which the world is promised, relates to modern English life, and that George Eliot for the first time will bring her genius to bear on our own eager, restless age. Hitherto she has only illustrated the beginning of the century in "Adam Bede" and "Silas Marner," and the time previous to and during the passing of the first Reform Bill in the others; and as the great historian uses "Memoires à Sevoir" and throws light on what is tedious and twaddling to the mere average reader, so does this great novelist with the literature and the traditions of the time; for she not only describes what she learns from them, but she accounts for what they omit to tell her. She takes country life and provincial life, she describes agricultural labourers with their "slow bovine gaze" and their "low ventral laugh"—farmers ignorant of high farming and artificial manures, but proud of their fat stock and clean fallows, their wives and daughters, even those of gentlemen-farmers, making cheese and butter with their own hands, and providing large stocks of home-made linen; parish clerks and innkeepers, lawyers and clergymen, manufacturers and bankers, with the country gentry towering over them, more by prestige than by superior intelligence;—all knotted together in a society intimately acquainted with the local doings and misdoings, but into which the metropolitan life of London and the cosmopolitan life of the world entered rarely and feebly; a life the dulness of which would oppress our modern, and especially our colonial, young men and women with despair, but which our fathers and grandfathers managed to live through. Only if you plant a heart and soul like that of Dorothea Brooke in such a limited sphere, if with all the desire to work and to bless there seemed to be nothing she could do for her fellow creatures but to give alms and be curtseyed to, you cannot wonder that she seized the opportunity offered her of what she thought a worthy life as helpmate to a man who had the reputation of being a great scholar, engaged in writing a great book, "The Key to all the Mythologies." If Dorothea had had the wide field we have now, the free intercourse with men and books, and the more independent scope for carrying out her own plans, she might probably have seen through the shallowness of Mr. Casaubon's mind, which would have been more valuable as a safeguard than seeing the moles on his face which her practical sister Celia saw so plainly.

When men speak of the sorrows and disappointments of active life, and say that woman in her sheltered sphere knows nothing of its sharpest trials, do they ever calculate what women suffer from dulness, from vacuity, from the want of a worthy object in life? Provincial life in England is not so dull as it was in Dorothea's time, thanks to railroads, telegraphs, and Mudie; but still all colonists find the atmosphere somewhat stifling, and after a long stay at the antipodes, the native village loses the charms as a residence with which childish memories have invested it. Here even women have more religious freedom, more social freedom, more varied pursuits, more intelligent friendships;—better things these than the material prosperity which, in the opinion of English people, is the only thing that can attract us in Australia, and I maintain that years in which many sharp pangs of sorrow and disappointment are alternated with hope and effort, are far preferable to that dead level of dulness which characterises so much of provincial life in the loveliest country in the world.

The atmosphere of dulness impresses us forcibly in Miss Austen's novels, as well as in George Eliot's. Both catch the salient points in the little society, both with native penetration and humour make the best of the little oddities that are to be found even in such circles; but the reader, though pleased, interested and amused, feels that such a life as her heroine led would be intolerable.

Lord Macaulay, in his praise of Jane Austen, speaks of her portraits of four young clergymen, all handsome, amiable, and in love, yet all totally different. True enough; but to modern ideas they are not clergymen at all. In "Adam Bede" George Eliot introduces us to a clergyman of the old stamp, but how much farther she lets us see into him than Jane Austen did or could do.

"The existence of insignificant people has very important consequences to the world. We can be shown to affect the price of bread and the rate of wages, to call forth many evil tempers from the selfish, and many heroines from the sympathetic, and in other ways to play no small part in the tragedy of life. And if that handsome, sweet-blooded clergyman, the Rev. Adolphus Irwine, had not had these two hopelessly maiden sisters, his lot would have been shaped very differently; he would have taken a comely wife in his youth, and now, when his hair was getting grey beneath the powder, would have had tall sons and blooming daughters—such possessions as men commonly think will repay them for all the labour they take under the sun."—*Adam Bede*, 56.

Mr. Roe, the travelling preacher, classed him with those who were given up to the lusts of the flesh and the pride of life; Will Maskeny, the Methodist wheelwright, called Mr. Irwine a "dumb dog" and an "idle shepherd."

"And it is impossible for me to deny that Mr. Irwine was altogether belied by the generic classification assigned him. He really had no lofty aims, no theological enthusiasm. If I were closely questioned, I should be obliged to confess that he felt no serious alarm about the souls of his parishioners, and would have thought it a mere loss of time to talk in a doctrinal and awakening manner to old 'Feyther' Taft, or even to Chael Cranage, the blacksmith. If he had been in the habit of speaking theoretically, he would perhaps have said that the only healthy form religion could take in such minds was that of certain dim but strong emotions, suffusing themselves as a hallowing influence over the family affections and neighbourly duties. He thought the custom of baptism more important than its doctrine, and that the religious benefits the peasant derives from the church where his fathers worshipped, and the sacred piece of turf where they lay buried, were but slightly dependent on a clear understanding of the Liturgy or the sermon. Clearly the Rector was not what is called in these days an 'earnest' man; he was fonder of church history than of divinity, and had much more insight into men's characters than interest in their opinions; he was neither laborious nor obviously self-denying, nor very copious in alms giving, and his theology, you perceive, was lax. His mental palate, indeed, was rather pagan, and found a savouriness in a quotation from Sophocles or Theocritus that was quite absent from any text in Isaiah or Amos. But if you feed your young setter on raw flesh, how can you wonder at its retaining a taste for uncooked partridge in after life? And Mr. Irwine's recollections of young enthusiasm were all associated with poetry and ethics that lay aloof from the Bible. On the other hand, I must plead, for I have an affectionate partiality towards the Rector's memory, that he was not vindictive, and some philanthropists have been so; that he was not intolerant, and there is a rumour that some zealous theologians have not been altogether free from that blemish; and that though he would have declined to give his body to be burned and was far from bestowing all his goods to feed the poor, he was tender to men's feelings, and unwilling to impute evil."—*Adam Bede*, 57.

It is thus that this dumb dog, this Gallio, speaks to Dinah Morris—76:—

"'Tell me how you first came to think of preaching?' 'Indeed, sir, I didn't think of it at all. I'd been used from the time I was sixteen to talk to the little children and teach them, and sometimes I had my heart enlarged and was much drawn out in prayer with the sick. Sometimes it seemed as if speech came to me without any will of my own, and words were given to me that came out as the tears come, because our hearts are full, and we cannot help it.'"

"'But tell me the circumstances; just how it was; the very day you began to preach?'"

"'It was one Sunday I walked with Brother Marlowe, an aged man, one of the local preachers, twelve miles, from Snowfield to Hetton-deeps, where there is no church nor preacher, but they live like sheep without a shepherd. But Brother Marlow was seized with a dizziness, and could not stand up to preach, and I went to tell the people, thinking he'd go into one of the houses, and I could read and pray with them; and I went to where the little flock of people were gathered together, and I spoke the words that were given to me abundantly. And they all came round me, and many wept over their sins, and have since been joined to the Lord. That was the beginning of my preaching, sir, and I have preached ever since.'"

"Mr. Irvine was deeply interested. He said to himself, 'He must be a miserable prig who would act the pedagogue here; one might as well go and lecture the trees for growing in their own shape.'"

As a contrast to Mr. Irwine, take Mr. Tryan, or Savanarola in Romola, all aglow with enthusiasm, somewhat onesided, but all the more effective on that account; or the earnest little Independent minister in "Felix Holt," Mr. Farebrother, with his little failings and his great generosities; Mr. Casaubon, to whom our poor dear Dorothea is bound; Mr. Cadwallader, careless about doctrine, but enthusiastic about feeling;—these, and many others sketched more slightly, but with a vigorous hand, make a gallery of clerical portraits as different from all those of Miss Austen as they are from each other. I think that on none of these does George Eliot dwell so lovingly as on Dinah Morris, that tender mystic with the helpful hands.

In descriptions and conversations of commonplace people, which is Jane Austen's strongest point, George Eliot is most felicitous. What could be more real and life-like than the Dodson Family, all satisfied with the family collectively, but snapping at the ways of each individually.

Mrs. Tulliver is a weaker Dodson, married to a man who will go a lawing, and with one child who "does not feature the Dodsons;" poor Maggie, thin-skinned, dark-haired, impulsive, eager for love, thirsting for knowledge, hungry for action, and blundering against all the proprieties and conventionalities of her mother and aunts. Even Tom Tulliver, who was fair and blue-eyed, and so far satisfactory, was open to much censure from his aunts. I think as a picture of a genuine boy, Tom is unsurpassed in fiction. Clear-headed and straightforward, but hard and unsympathetic; the object of Maggie's worshipping love, which he returns with a much more reasonable and therefore altogether inadequate affection; quick at figures, and with excellent business capacities, but detesting Latin and all things that had no practical bearing on life, he found that he had simply to forget the education his father had paid so dear for, and to educate himself anew when Mr. Tulliver's "lawing" had brought the family to ruin.

Mr. Tulliver thus expressed himself about his children:—

> "It's the wonderfullest thing as I picked out the mother, because she wasn't over cute, being a good-looking woman too, and come of a rare family for managing; but I picked her out from her sisters o' purpose, 'cause she was a bit weak like, for I wasn't agoing to be told the rights o' things by my own fireside. But you see, when a man's got brains himself, there's no knowing where they'll run to, and a pleasant sort o' soft woman may go on bringing you stupid lads and cute wenches till it's like as the world was turned topsy-turvy."

Mrs. Tulliver was what was called a

> "Good-tempered person; never cried when she was a baby on any slighter ground than hunger and pins, and from the cradle upward had been healthy, fair, plump, and dull-witted; in fact, the flower of the family for beauty and amiability. But milk and mildness are not the best things for keeping, and though they turn only a little sour, they may disagree with young stomachs seriously."

When "Adam Bede" appeared, although the average reading public did not form or did not express any distinct opinion as to the graver characteristics, its religious philosophy, the differences and similarities between the brothers Adam and Seth Bede, or the subtle touches by which the tragedy of Arthur Donnithorne and Hetty Sorel were indicated and followed out, so much more faithful to human nature than the somewhat parallel case of Steerforth and Little Emily in "David Copperfield," or who could appreciate the religious influence brought to bear on that poor, vain, ignorant Hetty, by

Dinah Morris, which led her to confession and to all the repentance she was capable of;—all agreed in unhesitating admiration of the minor characters—of the querulous mother Lisbeth Bede, and of the uncle and aunt of Dinah and Hetty, Mr. and Mrs. Poyser.

Many of Mrs. Poyser's sharp sayings have passed into proverbs, such as in speaking of the conceited Scotch gardener, that

"He was like a cock that thought the sun rose in the morning on purpose to hear him crow."

And,

"It's all very fine having a ready-made rich man, but it may happen he'll be a ready-made fool, and it's no use filling your pocket full o'money if you've got a hole in the corner. It'll do you no good sitting in a spring cart of your own if you've got a soft to drive you, he'll soon turn you out into the ditch. I'd never marry a man as had got no brains, for where's the use of a woman having brains of her own if she's tackled to a geck as everybody's a laughing at. She might as well dress herself fine to sit back'ards on a donkey."

She is a match for the woman-hater Bartle Massey, who says even of Dinah, that though he can listen to her without putting wool in his ears, in other matters he thinks—

"'She's like all the rest of the women, thinks two and two will come to make four if she only cries and bothers enough about it.'"

"'Ay, ay,' says Mrs. Poyser, 'One 'ud think, to hear some folks talk, as the men were cute enough to count the corns in a bag o' wheat wi' only smelling at it. They can see through a barn door, *they* can. Perhaps that's the reason they can see so little on this side on't.'"

"'Ah!' said Bartle, sneering, 'the women are quick enough—they're quick enough. They know the rights of a story before they hear it, and can tell a man's thoughts before he knows 'em himself.'"

"'Like enough," said Mrs. Poyser, 'for the men are mostly so slow, their thoughts overrun them, and they can only catch 'em by the tail. I can count a stocking-top while a man's getting his tongue ready; and when he outs with his speech at last, there's little truth to be made on it. It's your dead chicks take the longest hatching. However, I'm not denying the women are foolish, God Almighty made 'em to match the men.'"

"'Women's cleverness will never come to much, but they make excellent simpletons, ripe and strong flavoured.'"

"'What dost say to that,' said Mr. Poyser, throwing himself back in his chair and looking merrily at his wife.

"'Say? why I say as some folks' tongues are like the clock's, that run on striking, not to tell you the time o' the day, but because there's summat wrong i' their own insides.'"

With regard to our friend Mr. Irwine, Mrs. Poyser said:—

"Mr. Irwine was like a good meal o' victuals, you were the better for him without thinking on it; and Mr. Ryde was like a dose o' physic, he gripped you and worrited you, and after all he left you, all the same."

But it is impossible to do any justice to Mrs. Poyser with such extracts as these. We ought to be acquainted with herself and her surroundings. Her health delicate, but her mind active; her temper not to call sweet, but of a pleasant sort; her fine sense of the right thing when she would not find fault with Hetty in the hearing of the young man who was courting her; her sharpness with the maids, her overflowing tenderness to her children, all make up a woman who might occasionally provoke her husband, but who would never bore him. And we are glad to see that Mr. Poyser had the greatest confidence in his wife's judgment, and admiration of her wit; these good things might have been altogether thrown away if she had married a "soft," as she herself said.

Mrs. Holt has, in addition to the querulousness of Lisbeth Bede, an element of self-righteousness not to be found in the less instructed churchwoman. When her son Felix, the only one that lived out of six, and him the brownest and the most masterful of them all, insisted on giving up the pills and draughts, from which she derived her livelihood, and over which his father had prayed for a blessing, because from his knowledge of medicine he believed they were no blessing to the human stomach, and when he chose to be a working watchmaker instead of a gig-keeping quack doctor, who might marry a woman with property; she pours forth her complaints in scriptural language into the ears of the Rev. Rufus Lyon, under whom she *sits*, but whom her son rarely, if ever, goes to hear. To me, Rufus Lyon is the most charming of all George Eliot's clergymen. He has the open soul to see in Felix the goodness *out* of the gospel, to which he endeavours to lead his flock *through* it.

Many people consider "Felix Holt" the poorest of George Eliot's works, and no doubt the story of Mrs. Transome is painful in the extreme. But painful as it is, it conveys a salutary lesson, and a powerful one. What I object to in so much of our fictitious literature now-a-days is this: that young people are represented as playing with fire, and not getting burnt; as making the most imprudent admissions, as going to the greatest lengths in stolen interviews and dangerous caresses, and then something comes to save them from the full and natural consequences of these things. Some awkward husband, or unaccommodating wife, who stands in the way of lawful marriage, dies, compromises himself or herself so fatally as to make a divorce obtainable; or a previous marriage is discovered to nullify the bond apparently existing as a barrier between loving hearts; or at the critical moment, when the reader is on thorns as to what is to be the result of the impassioned interview, virtue prevails, and with one frantic kiss the lovers part for ever.

M. Taine says that all English novelists are tempted to spoil their stories as works of art, because their books are put indiscriminately into the hands of young girls as well as those of experienced men, and it is *de rigueur* that morality should not be shocked. Without in any way preferring the French novel, which has no such scruples, I protest against this shuffling of these timid English imitators as contrary to good morals; for it leads young people to think that all the intensity and excitement of a wrongly placed attachment can be enjoyed without serious mischief resulting from it.

Even when the English novelists I speak of make the natural consequence the result from the course the lovers have pursued, a broken heart and an early grave wind up the story, and all the sympathies of the reader are enlisted for the sinners. But in real life do we find that the awkward spouse dies at the right time? I think quite the contrary. Are old bonds discovered to snap burdensome new ones when a fairer future presents itself? Is it not easier to check dangerous preferences in their beginning than after they have been encouraged, as these novelists represent them to have been? Does virtue or a regard to consequences operate to save at the eleventh hour as it would do at the first? And are sinners charitably put to death by a broken heart when life would be blighted and disgraced.

I always admired greatly the few words in which Thackeray describes the position of Lady Clara Newcome, after her divorce, and her marriage to the man she loved, and who loved her; and I admire still more the vigorous hand that has drawn the portraits of Mrs. Transome and of Jekyll, thirty-four years after the sin which no one had discovered. For observe, she did not die—she lived—lived in constant intercourse with her old lover—lived to feel the baseness and the hollowness of the man for whose sake she had deceived her feeble husband, and stained her own soul—lived to see him married and respected, surrounded by a family of his own—lived to feel that she was in his power, and that he took the meanest advantage of that position—lived to see with horror the likeness in her son's face, and to tremble lest the world should see it too—lived to be disappointed in that son Harold, whose birth had been such a joy to her—lived to be degraded in his eyes, and disgraced in that of the world.

And what punishment did Nemesis bring to the other sinner? Was it not punishment enough that he should have grown so base, and that his own mean soul should have driven him to strike the final blow which involved himself in the disgrace? Surely Mrs. Transome's grief and remorse are preferable to his callous trading on it.

In this story, as well as in that of "Hetty Sorel," George Eliot is careful to make sin not alluring—not at all worth the price paid for it, and, therefore, however painful the stories may be, the moral influence is salutary.

George Eliot writes with no careless haste. During the seventeen years which have elapsed since the publication of "Scenes of Clerical Life," she has produced "Adam Bede," "Silas Marner," "The Mill on the Floss," "Romola," an Italian story of the times of Savanarola, and lastly, "Middlemarch," a study of provincial life, the longest, the most varied, and perhaps the finest of her works. One can count them nearly all on the fingers of one hand. This has been her life's work as a novelist, so far as we know, and what splendid work it is!

It is an undoubted fact that George Eliot's works have not so many readers, especially among the young, as the ephemeral sensational stories of the day. If, however, the quality of the admiration she excites can make up to a great author for the smaller quantity, George Eliot may find ample compensation there. No novels have called forth more appreciative criticism, and in intelligent households we find the books *bought*, cherished as classics, and referred to in conversation. Nay more, at critical periods of life, in times of doubt, of depression and disappointment, the words read years back recur to the mind, and often help to inspire with patience and with courage.

And yet the books are mostly sad. In "Middlemarch" we see the consequence of innocent blunders as inexorable as those of wrong-doing.

Dorothea, misled at nineteen by the enthusiasm of her own nature, and clothing the mole-eyed, middle-aged, egotistic scholar in the virtues that were dear to herself; and Lydgate deceived by a beauty, a softness and a grace, that seemed the incarnation of all feminine virtues, but which masked selfishness and insincerity—and both seeing the illusion wear off day by day.

Dorothea felt the exactingness, the jealousy, the injustice of the man she had married to honour and to help; she could no longer believe in his great book to which she had meant to minister; and he, Casaubon, was miserable in the thought that the lovely young woman he had been so fortunate as to win, had escaped from his influence, was unawed by his learning, and was doubtful as to his objects. A commoner author would have made all the pity flow to Dorothea, but she has pity for Mr. Casaubon too. Who can tell the torture which a jealous, exacting man can inflict upon himself, at the slightest touch, word, and gesture of the creature he feels ought to be all his own, but which he knows is not?

And Lydgate, too, with his higher aims dwarfed by the requirements of his pretty wife, who likes his good family and his gentlemanly appearance, but who dislikes his profession, that of the healer, and is only eager for the rewards of success, however attained. His aims to be the reformer of his profession, and to contribute something to science which the world would not willingly let die, have no charm for her, indeed appear to be absurd. Lydgate's life seems to have been made unreasonably hard for him by this one mistake. But when one considers the thoughtless way in which a marriage choice is made, and the very slight circumstances which lead to this irrevocable step, the world may be none the worse for a few words of warning.

Is there no one but Dorothea who would have seen in Mr. Casaubon's measured remark about not inquiring too curiously into motives, that—

> "He was a man who could understand the higher inward life, and with whom there could be some spiritual communion—nay, who could illuminate principle with the widest learning; a man whose learning almost amounted to a proof of whatever he believed." Dorothea's inferences may appear large, but really life could never have gone on at any period without this liberal allowance of conclusions which has facilitated marriage under the difficulties of civilization. Has any one pinched into its pilulous smallness the cobweb of pre-matrimonial acquaintance?"—*Middlemarch*, p. 13.

Lydgate's first opinion of Dorothea, the woman whom afterwards he admired and reverenced more than any other living being, was—

> "She is a good creature, that fine girl, but a little too earnest. It is troublesome to talk to such women. They are always wanting reasons, yet are too ignorant to understand the merits of any question, and usually fall back on their moral sense to settle things after their own taste—66. Lydgate was already conscious of being fascinated by a woman strikingly different from Miss Brooke. He did not in the least suppose that he had fallen in love with her, but he said of that particular woman 'She is grace itself; she is perfectly lovely and accomplished. This is what a woman ought to be; she ought to produce the effect of exquisite music.'"—67.

Now Dorothea Brooke did not look at things from the true feminine angle—

> "The society of such women was about as relaxing as going from your work to teach the second form, instead of reclining in a paradise with sweet laughs for bird notes, and blue eyes for a heaven."

How this angelic creature when she was his wife acted as a blight on his life; how she led him to involve himself in debt and felt it cruel to be asked to co-operate with him in retrenchment; how she undermined his best laid plans by double-dealing, and considered his honour as a trifle compared with her feelings and her comfort—and yet how in one critical, one supreme moment of her life, Dorothea called forth from that shallow soul a true response, it is not for me to tell, but for you to read, or if you have already read to recall, that you may acknowledge its fidelity and its power.

The manner in which pecuniary embarrassment cripples the best and the most honest intentions is told in the story of "Fred Vincy," and still more fully in that of "Lydgate." The gradual steps by which a man is led into debt and shifts and subterfuges are well described, and yet the reader will say he should have known better.

> "It is true that Lydgate was constantly visiting in his professional capacity the houses of the poor, and adjusting his prescriptions of diet to their small means; but, dear me! has it ceased to be remarkable that men should have numerous strands of experience lying side by side, and never compare them with each other? Expenditure, like ugliness and errors, becomes a totally new thing when we attach our own personality to it, and measure it by the wide difference between ourselves and others."—435.

How true this is! How many civil servants, clerks, and professional men talk like a book on the sinful extravagance and wastefulness of the lower orders and the higher classes. And in the latter cases with much greater excuse; an ignorant, uneducated man is naturally improvident; it is the tradition of his class from which he has not emerged. Those born wealthy are accustomed to despise business details; but for our array of civil servants, bank and merchants' clerks, professional men and tradespeople, all constantly reminded by their daily business of the value of money and the uncertainty of life, to live up to or beyond their means and to leave their dependent families unprovided for, is a judicial blindness that would be astonishing if it were not so common.

One reason why the average reading public do not run after George Eliot's novels as they do after much less artistic work is that they like sketches laid on with a broader brush, in which there can be no mistake as to the characters. The villains must be very black, black all through; the good people without any shadows; the cowards invariably ridiculous; the bullies always defeated and humbled; and the hypocrites must be of that unmistakable unctuous character familiar to the British stage, where the first speech and the first gesture proclaim him to the discerning public, and the only wonder is how he could deceive any one in the play or in the book. No one would ever think of dramatising George Eliot. What appearance would a hypocrite like Nicholas Bulstrode make on the stage, so self-deceiving, even when he deceives others? Hypocrisy is such an easy name to give to inconsistency which does not happen to be our own inconsistency, that it is given much too lightly by those who feel little as well as those who feel much on those subjects. We forget that we ourselves rarely act up to our own best moods when we say that if such a man was what he professed to be he could not act so and so; we forget the many ways in which we deceive our own selves for our own advantage, and are intolerant of others whose self-deception goes a little further, and perhaps in another direction.

And this is, after all, the grand lesson taught us by George Eliot—toleration; not because she is indifferent to the grand distinctions between right and wrong—true and false; no writer is clearer or more emphatic on these points; but toleration, because of her deep sympathy with the weakness and the temptations of human nature. The religious faith and insight which characterised her earlier novels are fainter in "Middlemarch," and that makes the book sadder. I cannot tell whether George Eliot has travelled from the idea of the perfectibility and immortality of the individual to those of the race; but the tone of some of her poems may be so interpreted. But no one can help forward the race without individually rising, and that passionate love of right which characterises her highest creations (notably "Romola" and "Dorothea"), in which she herself seems to speak most clearly, is the very strongest argument that can be brought forward for the continued conscious existence of the souls so inspired. In this George Eliot may be wiser than she herself knows, and may teach lessons she scarcely meant to teach. As there are diversities of administration, but the same spirit, so may many of those who protest most strongly against "other worldliness" be inconsistently building up on the surest foundations, that faith in the unseen and the hereafter, which is necessary as a motive power to the great mass of mankind, and serviceable even to the most exalted intellects.

If an author is super-excellent in one thing, the world is unwilling to grant him excellence in others, and the transcendent merits of George Eliot's prose fiction seem to have made the critical public reluctant to do full justice to her poems. But if the "Spanish Gypsy," "Jubal," "Armgart," and other lesser poems had proceeded from the pen of an unknown author, they would have placed her among the first of our living poets. They are too great to be dealt with parenthetically, at the fag-end of a paper like this—and this must be my apology for confining myself to the English novels and saying nothing of "Romola."

In this last, George Eliot reproduces Florence in the time of the Renaissance, with such fidelity that it is sold by hundreds there every year as a guide book, for she is not only the author of the greatest original powers of mind of any living, but the most highly cultivated, and the most painstaking; armed at all points by keen observation, careful reflection, and the widest reading.

Are George Eliot's books what Thackeray calls "Vanity Fair"—novels without heroes? Are Arthur Donnithorne, Godfrey Cass, Fred Vincy, and, descending to a lower depth, Tito Malema, the real representatives of the young men of the present day, with good intentions, but feeble resolutions, delighting in giving pleasure, unwilling to give pain, but still more unwilling to suffer it; drifting through circumstances into gross errors, and even crimes, without the courage to stem the tide which bears them along?

When after long years Godfrey Cass acknowledges the child, born of an early and disgraceful marriage, to the beloved wife whose censure he had dreaded—

> "'Oh! Godfrey,' said she, 'If you had but told me this six years ago, we could have done some of our duty by the child. Do you think I'd have refused to take her in if I'd known she was yours?'"

At that moment Godfrey felt all the bitterness of an error that was not simply futile, but had defeated its own ends. He had not measured the wife with whom he had lived so long. But she spoke again with more agitation—

> "'And oh! Godfrey, if we had had her from the first; if you had taken to her as you ought, she'd have loved me for her mother, and you'd have been happier with me. I could better have bore my little baby dying, and our life would have been more like what we used to think it 'ud be.' The tears fell and Nancy ceased to speak.

"'But you wouldn't have married me then, Nancy, if I'd told you,' said Godfrey, urged on by the bitterness of his self-reproach to prove to himself that his conduct had not been utter folly. 'You may think that you would have, but you wouldn't then; what with your pride, and your father's, you'd have hated having anything to do with me after the talk there'd have been.'

"'I can't say what I should have done about that. I should never have married anybody else. But I wasn't worth doing wrong for. Nothing is in this world—nothing is so good as it seems beforehand, not even our marriage wasn't, you see.'"—*Scenes of Clerical Life and Silas Marner*, 474.

I should like our colonial young people to weigh what this keen-sighted woman of genius says about the essential attributes of a gentlewoman. It is the easiest and the cheapest kind of wit to sneer at ignorance of things conventionally deemed indispensable, but some little mistakes in grammar or pronounciation, and ignorance of etiquette, do not prevent me from thinking many of the mothers in our colonial society more intrinsically gentlewomen than the daughters who make themselves odious by looking down on them. Until this kind of thing is looked on as bad taste or "bad form," it is of no use to preach of its being bad morals, and to quote from the oldest code, the fifth commandment. As it is not the well-filled purse that makes the gentleman, neither is it the boarding-school acquirements, the scraps of French and German, or the acquaintance with the forms of society, that make the lady.

Miss Nancy Lammeter said "mate" for "meat," and "'appen" for "perhaps." There is scarcely a servant maid in these days who is not better informed than she was, yet she had the essential attributes of a lady—high veracity, delicate honour in her dealings, deference to others, and refined personal habits.

One regrets for Nancy's sake that the long disowned child clung to Silas Marner, the weaver who had adopted her, and married the working man, who could not be raised in the social scale, but it was the right thing and the natural thing.

If this paper had not exceeded all reasonable bounds, I should make no apology for quoting in conclusion three sonnets, not because they are the best of the poems, but because they are from a series called "Brother and Sister," which appear to me to be the only personal things I can collect from this most impersonal author, but that she had such a brother, and was such a sister, I have no doubt. They run thus:—

"We had the self-same world enlarged for each
By loving difference of girl and boy.
The fruit that hung on high above my reach
He plucked for me; and often would employ

A measuring glance to guide my tiny shoe
  Where lay firm stepping stones, or call to mind
This thing I like my sister may not do,
  For she is little and I must be kind.
Thus boyish Will the nobler mastery learned,
  Where inward vision over impulse reigns—
Widening its life with separate life discerned,
  A Like unlike, a Self that self restrained;
    His years with others must the sweeter be
    For those brief days he spent in loving me.

" His sorrow was my sorrow, and his joy
  Sent little leaps and laughs through all my frame;
My doll seemed lifeless, and no girlish toy
  Had any reason when my brother came.
I knelt with him at marbles, marked his fling,
  Cut the ringed stem, and make the apple drop;
Or watched him winding close the spiral string
  That looped the orbits of the humming-top.
Grasped by such fellowship, my vagrant thought
  Ceased with dream fruit dream wishes to fulfil.
My aëry picturing fantasy was taught
  Subjection to the harder, truer skill
    That seeks with deeds to grave a thought-tracked line,
    And by 'what is' 'what will be' to define.

" School parted us; we never found again
  That childish world where our two spirits mingled;
Like scents from varying roses that remain
  One sweetness, nor can ever more be singled.
Yet the twin habit of that early time
  Lingered for long about the heart and tongue;
We had been natives of one happy clime,
  And its dear accent to our utterance clung
Till the dire years whose awful name is Change
  Had grasped our souls still yearning in divorce,
And pitiless shaped them in two forms that range,
  Two elements which sever their life's course.
    But were another childhood-world my share
    I would be born a little sister there."

C. H. SPENCE.

Adelaide.

THE SUPERNATURAL.

Do not imagine, gentle reader, from the title of this article that I am about to treat of the facts or the fancies of modern Spiritism. My path lies, if not in an entirely opposite direction, at least so far away from the ghostly spheres, that these will not exercise any perceptible influence on our movements and investigations. From one point of view it is true that the supernatural is only another term for the spirit land; and that modern spiritism professes to be a system or city built up within the borders of that land. Let it be so. Even then it is not my intention to take so much as a telescopic view of its misty walls and vapoury palaces.

It must be confessed, however, that Spiritism is one of the most significant signs of the age. The attention it has almost everywhere aroused, the interest it has excited, and the prolonged investigations which it has received from men who are perfectly capable of subjecting its phenomena to the rigorous tests of experiment and scientific induction, all prove, if nothing else did, the intense sympathy the human mind has for questions which skirt the horizon of positive knowledge; and with what power it is urged to investigate those subjects that are supposed, in some way or other, to be identified with the supernatural. From this fact also it may be safely inferred that the intellectual and moral wants and longings of our times are not to be met by the mere discoveries of science however brilliant. With an earnestness and sincerity which have had no parallel in the history of the world, men are now everywhere asking themselves whether there is a future world, and a personal conscious immortality. The heart of this generation is like to break with the suspicion that has thrown its dark shadow over many minds that there is not for us an Almighty Father, to enlighten our darkness, to banish our fears, and to lift us, if not out from amongst the forces of nature, at least into such an exalted conception of their character and purpose that they shall be felt by us as the very throbbings of His infinite love. This faith has by no means departed from the deeper thoughts of men, but there is at present much apparent speculation and not a little uneasiness as to the basis on which such sentiments rest, and the process by which it may be rationally vindicated.

Now it can hardly be called in question that the supernatural is that around which the most of the problems of modern thought cluster and cling. Here indeed is the very root of the matter. As all rivers are said to run into the sea, so all the streams of human thought may be regarded as running into the supernatural abyss; and although we may not be able to sound its profound depths, we are anxious to know if possible something about it, and especially to satisfy ourselves whether those murmuring sounds that fill our ears when we stand listening on the verge, are the echoes of our own inquiries, or muffled voices from distant shores. It would be no exaggeration to say that a man's faith is not only determined but measured by the conclusions he has come to or the opinions he holds on the subject of the supernatural.

In discussing this question, therefore, the first thing that demands our attention is the necessity of obtaining, if not a logical definition, at least such a description of the supernatural as shall satisfy our minds, and clear away from them the mists of indefiniteness and the haze of uncertainty. It is much to be regretted that this has not been more done by writers on the subject. At all events, I have failed in meeting with anything very satisfactory on this point. The difficulty of giving a definition that would be generally accepted and satisfactory to all parties is, no doubt, very great, and this can only be accounted for, partly by the fact that we are not yet all agreed as to what the supernatural is—what it includes and what it excludes, and partly also from the natural and inevitable obscurity of the subject itself.

In seeking to arrive at a clear conception of the nature of the supernatural, we may begin by excluding all those facts and operations of nature which it is the province of science, properly so called, to investigate and classify. It may be said that it is as much the duty of scientific men to inquire into the nature of so-called supernatural facts, and endeavour, by a careful classification if possible, to find out their laws and forces; and within certain limits this is not denied; but it must be obvious to every one that, whatever conclusion we may arrive at with regard to the supernatural, its facts or phenomena cannot possibly belong to the present system of nature as far as that system is known to us by the use of our faculties on the operations of nature. Our position as yet amounts to no more than this, that a supernatural fact cannot, by the very terms of the definition, be a natural fact. If this is admitted, and we cannot see how it can be rejected, it follows that a miracle, or in other words a supernatural fact, cannot either be accurately described or rationally explained as the product of natural causes of which we are ignorant. And yet this is a very common and favourite hypothesis with some writers. A moment's reflection will show that it is perfectly untenable; for if this definition were correct, the supernatural would be simply equivalent to the unknown or the undiscovered; and as such it would cease to be the supernatural when the light of science had risen upon it, and when by the laws of conquest it had been added to the ever-extending empire of the human mind. The distinction between a supernatural fact and a natural one must not be lost. The latter may be the product of some unknown cause, or even an unknown effect from a known cause; but a supernatural fact is one which by its very definition does not admit of any such explanation, and according to our present position is absolutely removed from the very possibility of ever being classified with the facts and laws of natural phenomena. Assuming, for example, that it was incontestably proved that on a certain occasion a solid piece of iron floated upon the surface of water, the singularity of such fact and its opposition to the general experience of mankind would compel us to seek after a cause sufficient for its explanation. But after the most patient investigation into this one fact alone, let us suppose we failed to discover its cause, the most rational thing for us to do in such a case would be to suspend our judgment, and not either unscientifically refer it to any unknown natural cause, or superstitiously attribute it to the agency of supernatural beings.

The same argument will apply with equal force to the theory of the supernatural which defines it as the coming down of a higher law upon the present sphere of natural forces and operations. This is a favourite notion with some, and the complacency with which it is held, and supposed to explain the whole mystery of the supernatural, is a striking illustration of how easy it is to satisfy some minds with the form of an explanation whose terms are perfectly destitute of meaning. The higher-law hypothesis of the supernatural is so absurd that it hardly admits of refutation, In the first place, it is ushered in by a very modest and dubious "may," for no one can affirm it as a fact, and no hypothesis is legitimate that attempts to explain a somewhat anomalous class of facts by attributing them to a law or cause whose very existence is a pure assumption. In the second place, the higher-law explanation, even if granted, would be perfectly useless, if not actually pernicious. No one would be justified in accepting it as an intelligent or a scientific definition of the supernatural. For if the supposed law is no more than an unknown natural law, that is, a law on the same plane as those already known to us, it would not be the supernatural. On the other hand, if it is not a natural law, it will be time enough to enquire whether it is a supernatural law when we have ascertained our supernatural facts, and satisfied the demands of reason by a rigid classification. If it could be proved, for example, that the fact sought to be explained by the phrase "higher law," would necessarily emerge again on the existence and combination of the same natural causes: that, in fact, the same antecedents being present, the same consequents would follow, the law originally supposed to exist would now be proved. It would cease to be hypothesis, and become law, but that law would not be supernatural. The discovery of such a law would certainly enlarge the domain of human knowledge; but we would be as far as ever from the boundary of the supernatural. On the other hand, if the supposed law does not belong to the present order of nature, it is a gross abuse of language to call it a law at all. It may be a law of the supernatural, and it may not. If the supernatural is a sphere of existence, it has no doubt its laws like other spheres. In the meantime, what we want is a clear definition of what the supernatural is, and whether it has any existence as an objective fact, and when we have answered these questions in the affirmative, we shall then perhaps be in a position to inquire whether our knowledge of its facts is so extensive and varied as to warrant a classification of them for the purpose of ascertaining the laws of its existence and manifestation. Assuming that from certain anomalous and scattered facts, we were compelled to believe in an unseen and intelligent universe outside the present order of nature, but in occasional contact with the natural world, it is obvious that we could not know anything of that universe unless what these facts revealed. The question would then be, do the facts exist in such number and variety as to warrant us in inferring from them any general principles, either as to the facts themselves, or as to the unseen universe of which they are supposed to be the proof? No one, as far as I know, has ever attempted anything like a scientific classification of these facts; and, if so, where is the "higher law" of which they are presumed to be the evidence and proof? It has been suggested by some, and the idea has been eagerly grasped at by others, and especially by modern Spiritists, that the invisible universe is in contact with this world at certain definite points, and under certain invariable conditions. The hope is even vainly cherished by not a few dreamers that in the progress of science we may yet be able to hold rational converse with supernatural intelligences. But if spirits from the vasty deep, or elsewhere, can be summoned to our side, say by chemical synthesis, or by spectrum analysis, our first duty would be clearly to ascertain and define the "lower" laws on which the manifestation depends before we speculate on the "higher" ones, of which the manifestation is an illustration. If there is a space where the two worlds met and unite in accordance with law, we have got no further than this, that within that space the supernatural is governed by the same laws that we have ascertained to exist in the present world, but in this there is no discovery of "higher law." It may be contended that this so-called "higher law" is a law of the supernatural alone, and we ask whether we are to regard it as a law of its existence, or simply a law regulating its manifestation and contact with the natural world and with mankind? It cannot be the former, for that is unknown to us, and, for aught we know, may be incommensurable with our present mode of existence altogether. Nor do the facts point to anything like law in the order, or manner of its manifestations. Contact with the natural, from a supernatural standpoint, may be as much a miracle as from a natural point of view. Instead, therefore, of reposing on the false foundation of "higher law," it would be better for the speculative spirit to acknowledge that there are limits to human thought, although none to the elements of knowledge.

The only other hypothesis of the supernatural that requires any special notice at the present time is that which describes it as an extraordinary or exceptional divine causality. Under this view of the matter the divine Being is represented as concealing Himself in the ordinary laws and operations of nature, but in the miracle as stepping out into visible manifestation; and thus making Himself known by an act of special potency, and for a distinct and special purpose. This without its attempted philosophical explanation may be accepted as the popular opinion on the subject of miracles. The untutored mind that instinctively grasps at the truth, and is incapable of the refinement of theory, believes that miracles are the direct operation of the Divine Being. From this standpoint the Creator is thought of as working indirectly, but constantly and without shadow of turning, in the various operations of nature with which we are everywhere surrounded; but in the miracle or supernatural as acting directly by a special exercise of will, somewhat analogous to ourselves when by a special putting forth of our executive faculty we interfere or break in upon the natural current of our life and action. Hence it is argued that God is not, and cannot be controlled by nature; that He is of necessity above nature, and that it would be absurd to suppose that He, a Being of infinite power, could not at pleasure, either by operating upon the chain of causes or by a special act of His Divine powers, which must for the time being neutralise or even suspend some of the ordinary operations of nature, attain those moral and spiritual purposes which it is the design of miracle to accomplish. Assuming the existence of God, and the fact of His manifestation in the universe, this view of the subject for practical and poetical purposes is not to be lightly esteemed or thoughtlessly rejected. As we can only think of God within the limits and conditions of our own nature, there is nothing inconsistent in the conception that His executive acts in some way correspond to the operation of the human will; and this view of the subject has been the fountain from which every stream of sacred song has burst forth that has refreshed and elevated mankind. But considered as an explanation of the supernatural it is singularly unsatisfactory. It is neither philosophical nor scientific. While professing to know something of the laws of nature, and the forces that are ever acting around us, we are after all absolutely and hopelessly ignorant of the manner in which the Divine Being carries on the various operations of nature; and if the Divine causality in its ordinary manifestation conveys to us no positive knowlege, and defies all our powers of comprehension, no one will venture to say we can have any clearer conception of a *special* Divine causality. Do we then exclude the Divine agency from the miraculous? By no means. But the position we occupy is this, that if a belief in a personal God and superintending Providence is not inconsistent with the scientific standpoint, and for myself I must say I see no incompatibility between them, then it follows inevitably that God must be presumed to underlie supernatural facts in the same way as He is supposed to underlie and explain natural phenomena. According to this view there is no natural fact without God in it, and there is no supernatural fact that is not also ultimately the outcome of the divine energy. If an angel were to alight upon this world and hold intelligent conversation with us, we would not be far wrong in regarding his appearance as a supernatural fact; but there is no reason why we should believe that there is more of God in such a fact, considered in itself, than in the birth of a child by natural generation. Having cleared our way thus far, we are now, perhaps, prepared for a definition of the supernatural, or such a description of it as shall satisfy the intellect and supply us with a basis for an inquiry into its nature, and the relation it sustains to the physical universe and human history. By the supernatural, then, I understand the doctrine which affirms the existence of intelligent creatures above or outside the sphere of human intelligence. This doctrine is not, of course, purely speculative, but is based on the existence of a certain class of facts which are believed to admit of no other interpretation. According to this definition, the supernatural is first of all an inference from a certain number of admitted facts; but when inferred it may become the basis of a system, and in its turn help materially to elucidate the phenomena which gave it birth. Whatever may be said of this definition, it has at least this merit, that while it is sufficiently comprehensive to admit the various theories that have been held regarding the supernatural, it carefully avoids attempting any explanation of its modes of existence or the forms of its manifestation.

The importance of this definition will not perhaps be seen at first. Its very simplicity may be with some its strongest condemnation. Nevertheless it really comprehends all that is essential to our idea of the supernatural. If it can be proved that there are intelligences superior in some things to ourselves, outside the present order of things, who have occasionally taken part in the affairs of this world, we shall have a rational basis for faith and religion; but without such a basis we can hardly imagine how they can be vindicated at all. On the other hand, if the evidence is not sufficient to establish the doctrine of the supernatural as here understood, men and races may still continue to believe in it, cherishing, in spite of the absence of proof, the hope of a personal immortality, and building on this hope a system of religious observances; but the reconciliation of science and religion, if not an absolute impossibility, would be a very distant and uncertain contingency. Even then it is true, men of science would not be able to disprove the doctrine of immortality, for its belief would be too deep for their methods to reach. On the other hand, it would be impossible to convince the scientific mind of the rational characteristics of religion, because, in the case supposed, of the utter absence of facts to support the doctrine of the supernatural, on which the main part of the superstructure of religion rests.

The settlement of the question of the supernatural would be greatly simplified and facilitated if the discussion were scrupulously kept to the facts of the case. What is the historical evidence on which the belief of the supernatural rests? And are the facts of such a character as to warrant the belief in it with such moral certitude as would entitle it to be called a rational belief? If the investigation of the subject had ever been circumscribed by the lines which these questions indicate, we should in all likelihood have been nearer the end of the war between science and religion; but unfortunately for all parties the question has been lifted out of the region of fact and induction, and we are now-a-days everywhere met by the startling assertion that the supernatural is impossible. We are gravely told that science is fast and vigorously crushing out from men's minds the belief in the miraculous, and although our informants do not believe in the gift of prophecy, they venture to predict that in a few years men will be ashamed to acknowledge their belief in anything beyond the facts of the visible universe, and the laws which govern its manifold energy.

Leaving for the present the historical argument, for or against the reality of miracles, let us consider, for a little, those *a priori*, or, more correctly preliminary objections that are considered fatal to its very existence—arguments supposed by some to be so strong and unanswerable that they will not condescend even to examine the facts from which the existence of the supernatural is inferred, and on the validity of which it rests. The discussion will now therefore, for the remainder of this article, narrow itself simply to the question of the *possibility* of the supernatural; and if it can be shown that there is absolutely nothing against the possibility of the supernatural, there should be little difficulty in settling the question by an appeal to facts and the teachings of history.

The first objection we meet with is this, that it is utterly useless to consider the evidence adduced in support of the miraculous, for the supernatural is contrary to experience, and therefore is at once to be rejected and summarily dismissed. There is some confusion of thought here as to whether miracles are supposed to be inconsistent with experience properly so called, or the generalisations and inferences of experience. At present I shall consider the objection as one drawn from experience itself, without reference to those general principles which underlie and explain experience. Wherein, then, or how does experience affirm the impossibility of miracles? According to the laws of testimony, no amount of negative evidence is sufficient to invalidate the positive statement of one credible witness. If A. stole a sum of money, and B. saw him do it, the fact that no one else in the whole world saw A. take the money does not disprove B.'s statement. B.'s evidence may not be sufficient to convict A., but A. cannot prove his innocence or B.'s falsehood by summoning ten thousand witnesses to declare that they did not see him take the money. Now, hundreds and thousands, yea millions of persons may never have witnessed a miracle, but on the ground of experience alone their negative evidence is not sufficient in itself to invalidate the testimony of those who declare in the most solemn and rational manner that they have been eye-witnesses to what admits of no other explanation than the assumption of an unseen universe in contact with the seen and temporal. The only other way in which the facts of experience can be supposed to be inconsistent with the notion of the supernatural and destructive of it, is either that the facts have in all asserted cases been successfully disproved, or, admitting them, that the inference of the supernatural is not warranted either by the nature or the number of the facts themselves. But this has never been done, and the difficulty of doing it is almost insurmountable. For example, Christianity as a supernatural religion rests mainly upon the doctrine of the resurrection of Jesus. The same men who give us information about his life, his sayings, including the prophecy of his sufferings, death, and rising again from the dead, circumstantially detail the manner of his death, and record with the utmost minuteness the fact of his rising from the grave the third day, and appearing unto many. If historically proved, the doctrine of the resurrection must be accepted as an important fact in the evidence for the existence of the supernatural. Now, in what respect is this doctrine contrary to the *facts* of experience? It cannot be disproved by a thousand witnesses who did not see him after his crucifixion. The facts themselves on which the doctrine of the resurrection rests have not been invalidated; on the other hand they have been substantially admitted on historical grounds alone by those who at the same time reject the supernatural hypothesis which the facts suggest. It is for those who admit the facts and reject the theory to give some more rational or scientific explanation if they can. To believe conscientiously that the facts do not warrant the conclusion in regard to the resurrection, is at least comprehensible however inconsistent; but on the ground of experience alone, no one is justified in rejecting the doctrine of the supernatural. But if not inconsistent with the facts of experience, it may be argued that the supernatural is inconsistent with its inferences. It is said it is rather suspicious, if nothing more, that with the progress of enlightenment the so-called manifestations of the supernatural are becoming fewer and fewer; that in many cases the asserted facts have been proved to be falsehoods, the result of trickery and deception. It is argued therefore in this way that if in some instances which were thoroughly investigated at the time, the claim of supernatural agency was shown to be irrational and unnecessary, the presumption is that in other cases too remote for investigation the conclusion arrived at would in all probability be as unsatisfactory to the theory of the supernatural as in those instances when it was examined and found wanting. Without wishing in the smallest degree to weaken the force of this argument, no one surely will contend that the supernatural can be disposed of after this fashion. A certain king said in his haste, all men are liars; but the princely race of thinkers, who are always presumably cool, cannot surely commit themselves to the opinion that all men are either fools or rogues. If on a dark night a certain ghost should on being challenged to stand or be shot at, with very unbecoming and suspicious haste disappear, leaving its white sheet behind it, it does not follow that all ghosts would have made their exit when appealed to in the same manner. There is no reason why any one should disbelieve in a future state, because it can be conclusively shown that his dreams concerning the future world, delicious or otherwise, are the creation of his own brain, or the result of indigestion. Nor can the supernatural be resolved into a mere figure of speech. Our modes of thought and expression no doubt differ considerably. The rising or the setting of the sun can be variously described according to the particular influence or emotion that governs us at the time; but neither religion nor poetry, although looking upon such a scene, and representing it as the work of God, has ever represented it is anything beyond or above an ordinary incident, or any departure from the usual course of nature.

It is further asserted that the supernatural is inconsistent with the discoveries and the teachings of science, and therefore impossible. It is at once conceded that the facts of science must be believed, and every legitimate inference deduced from scientific data must be accepted at whatever risk or sacrifice. We cannot all be judges of what the facts of science really are. We must here, as well as elsewhere, take a great deal on trust; but we can use our reasoning powers, and we claim in all cases the right to say whether any particular argument is fallacious or otherwise. Now if the supernatural is inconsistent with any scientific *fact*, let that fact be produced, and its incompatibility with the supernatural pointed out. But, as far as I know, no one has ever staked his scientific reputation by asserting that there is such a fact. The law of *habeas corpus* will apply here, and if there is no *corpus* there is no crime; so if there is no adverse fact, there is no argument. It is joyfully admitted that science has recently thrown a flood of light upon many of the operations of nature: that she has made plain and harmonious what formerly looked anomalous or mysterious: that she has cleared the woods and mountain streams of fairies and other strange and supermundane creatures, and having invaded the dark places of the earth, she has let in the sweet light and air of heaven into its darkest and deepest recesses. Under her benign sway, "hobgobblins and chimeras dire" have either disappeared, or, tamed from their wildness, have been made useful instruments in the diffusion of human knowledge. But is is surely too much, if it is not grossly unscientific, to say that any fact or combination of facts have disproved the possibility of the supernatural. The saltness of the sea does not disprove the freshness of the overflowing lakes or the running streams; and how the creation of a scientific ghost, that can be resolved into nothing by a wave of the hand, can disprove the existence of all supernatural ones, transcends our comprehension.

But it is said that if the *facts* of science do not directly upset the theory of the supernatural, those general principles deduced from its facts, and lying at the basis of all true reasoning in science, are quite inconsistent with its notion. The uniformity of nature is one of those principles, so also is the law of continuity. Now as nature is not capricious, but uniform in all her operations, moreover as we cannot imagine that any part of the universe should be contradictory to any other part, or that at any moment we run the risk of having the whole superstructure of our knowledge overthrown, and the present *order* of things abolished by the introduction of confusion and anarchy, it is argued by some that as miracles are such interuptions, and therefore if not absolutely impossible, they are at least extremely improbable. We may admit that from a scientific point of view they are improbable, and that, in the first instance at least, the presumption is against them. But the only inference from such an admission is this, not that the evidence for the supernatural is to be summarily dismissed without examination, but that rather it is to be subjected to more rigorous tests, for the proof of any fact must of course bear some relation to the fact itself, and just in proportion to its departure from general experience is the necessity for convincing and irrefragable evidence. But surely it is unreasonable to say that the admission of the inferences and first principles of science is destructive of the possibility of the supernatural. For in the first place, the ground covered by such general principles, although by assumption it is wider than the facts which suggest them, is not supposed to be valid for any other class of facts that are not commensurable with them. In the second place, those first principles of science, considered as generalisations of experience, are for the most part of a negative character, and while supreme in their own sphere, cannot be accepted as laying down the conditions of existence in regions outside their jurisdiction. The law of continuity, for example, denies the existence of breaks or surprises in the order of nature, and by implication it affirms the stability and correctness of the foundations of our present knowledge; but it does not and cannot affirm that the supernatural is any violation of its law. Some even go further, and say that the supernatural is demanded by the mind in order to the consistent maintenance of this law. But whether or not this is evident, that when the facts or principles of science are run down to their extreme limits, and carried out to their logical consequences, by a law of thought we are compelled, like Herbert Spencer, to acknowledge either the existence of a power in the universe of which we can form no conception whatever, or to take refuge in the belief that the chain of causes, although never broken, runs through many and varied transformations, until at last it terminates in Deity, in whom we have not only the explanation of the natural, but the highest form and most rational explanation of the supernatural. But neither of these alternatives is the drect teaching of science. Our facts push us along into the region of laws; and our laws lead us to the higher ground of first principles; but when, by these first principles, we reach the utmost bounds of human knowledge, we discover on the misty confines that there are regions of infinite extent beyond, of which we know absolutely nothing. And whether we lie down in scientific helplessness and bewail our invincible ignorance, or take refuge in the faith that, underlying the forms and forces of existence, there is an infinite God, we alike make the standpoint of our positive knowledge the basis on which to rear a theory of the universe; and within the ample compass of either theory there is room enough and to spare for the supernatural. It is therefore absurd and unreasonable to say that it is inconsistent with the discoveries of modern science. It is bad philosophy and worse science that would dispose of the supernatural in such a fashion as this. There is no despotism in the kingdom of thought; but it smacks of haughty imperialism first to lay down the law that miracles are impossible, and then contemptuously to dismiss the evidence as unworthy of serious consideration. Rightly viewed, therefore, there is no contradiction between science and faith, and if so, there is no reason why there should be any antagonism. According to this view, the natural no more excludes the supernatural than the brain excludes the reasoning faculties, or the circulation of the blood the capacity of human emotion.

Finally, as no one has as far as I know ever mentioned the opinion that the supernatural is inconceivable to thought and therefore impossible, no formal refutation is required. My remarks may now therefore be brought to a close. It has been my aim in these pages to define what is meant by the supernatural; to take exception to some of the theories that are held regarding it; and to point out that the possibility of the supernatural is not contradicted either by the facts of experience or the inferences of science. If I have made good my position that the supernatural is not impossible, the real question at issue in any given case where supernatural agency is asserted is one of fact and evidence alone. We must of course first of all be sure of our facts, we must also guard against the vicious habit of crude and hasty induction; but if after the most careful and patient investigation we cannot explain our facts on any other intelligent theory than by the hypothesis of the existence of supernatural beings who are in some way enabled to come into contact with the present order of things, let us admit it, and have the courage to acknowledge it, and whatever else may be wrapped up in it for our guidance and happiness.

A. GOSMAN.

LETTERS AND LETTER-WRITERS.

We are told that letter-writing is rapidly becoming a lost art. The daily press and the great development of periodical literature are believed to have usurped the place of the epistolary correspondence of our forefathers.

The ground covered by these adjuncts of modern civilisation is, however, scarcely within the province of any style of letter-writing it would be desirable to revive or continue. It may be true the *Court Circular* supplies to some extent the place once occupied by the letters of that elegant trifler and most entertaining of male gossips, Horace Walpole, the airy chronicler of the latest fashionable intelligence and the newest Court scandal. The average letter that attempts to rival a newspaper in its minute details of events, or a magazine article in its impersonal discussion of some topic of general interest, is a very dreary missive to receive.

Some time since a writer in the *Saturday Review* gave as a reason for the decline of letter-writing, the fact that almost everybody now-a-days writes more or less for the public with a view to remuneration, and therefore the literary effort necessary to write a good letter represents so much ready money. To send your friend a letter full of jokes, or containing thoughts that might be elaborated into a magazine article, was, according to this professor of the economics of literature, equivalent to putting your hand in your pocket and presenting him with a five-pound note! It would be humiliating to believe that so sordid a view of the amenities of friendship could become general enough to cause a cessation of genial and interesting correspondence. The same pecuniary estimate would apply to conversation. What a pall of silence and dulness would fall upon society if such monetary considerations should ever interfere to stop the sparkling jest or humorous narration of our brilliant talkers! Fancy some wit of literary proclivities, suddenly checking the mirthful sally with the recollection of how much *Punch* would be willing to pay him for it if it remained unuttered!

The Autocrat of the Breakfast-table has expressed his belief that some people save their bright thoughts as too valuable to be wasted in conversation, Judging from the rarity of bright thoughts in ordinary social converse, this may be a legitimate conclusion. He cites the remark of an admiring friend who remonstrated thus:—"Why you are wasting merchantable literature, a cash article, at the rate, as nearly as I can tell, of fifty dollars an hour." The talker led him to a window whence could be seen a man watering the dusty street with a sprinkling machine, and asked, "Why don't you tell that man he is wasting the water? What would be the state of the highways of life if we did not drive our thought sprinklers through them with the valves open sometimes?" It is to be hoped there are still good souls among us, who are so far beyond the reach of mercenary feelings, as to continue to drive their thought sprinklers through the dusty highways and the lonely bye-ways of life in the shape of genial letters.

We cannot believe that while human nature remains constituted as it is there can ever come a time when letter writing will be extinct, as the art of colouring a mediæval missal, or embalming an Egyptian king. Friendship will never cease to desire the communion of thought and feeling which can be had most completely through the medium of letter writing. The affectionate nature will always want to bridge over separation. The reserved nature will continue to value the unwonted freedom of expression which the quiet hour invites.

> "Blessed be letters," says *Ike Marvel*—"they are the monitors, they are also the comforters, and they are the only true heart-talkers! Speech is conventional, moulded by circumstances, suggested by the observation, remark or influence of those to whom it is addressed or by whom it may be overheard. Your truest thought is modified half through its utterance by a look, a sign, a smile, or a sneer. It is not individual; it is not integral: it is social and mixed—half of you and half of others. It bends, it sways, it multiplies, it retires and it advances as the talk of others presses, relaxes, or quickens.
>
> "But it is not so of letters: there you are with only the soulless pen and the snow-white virgin paper. Your soul is measuring itself by itself and saying its own sayings: there are no sneers to modify its utterance—no scowl to scare—nothing is present but you and your thought.
>
> "Utter it then freely—write it down—stamp it—burn it in the ink! There it is a true soul-print!
>
> "Oh! the glory, the freedom, the passion of a letter! It is worth all the lip-talk in the world."

It is said that English women are fond of dancing because the freedom of motion is a relief from the reserve of English manners. To many reserved natures, letter-writing forms a similar outlet whereby they escape from the restraints of their own habit of mind. Whether it is owing to this that English letter-writers take so high a rank in this branch of literature, we do not attempt to decide. Such a conjecture receives some countenance, however, from the well-known temperament of the prince of English letter-writers, the poet Cowper. The life-long victim of a constitutional shyness, that incapacitated him for the active duties of the world—with a nature that closed in upon itself like the leaves of the sensitive plant, at the touch of untoward circumstances or the breath of uncongenial surroundings—a morbid habit of self-introspection adding its unspeakable torture to the delicate sensibilities, crushed by the overwhelming burden of religious doubt and unrest, that was never lifted from his saintly soul till the grave closed over the prolonged misery. This man found the chief consolation of his recluse life in correspondence with those whose kindred sympathies could afford to the poor trembling shrinking soul the support he needed. "The wild flower's tendril, proof of feebleness, proves strength, and so he flung his feelings forth, the tendrils of the heart to bear him up." As a natural result of the secluded life and introspective mind of the gentle poet, his letters are mainly about himself, yet he is never egotistical. He has nothing in common with some brilliant letter-writers whose "ego" is always offensively in the foreground, whose details of surrounding circumstances, however interesting, are all toned to throw into brighter relief the central figure intended to absorb all our thoughts, our sympathy, and if possible our admiration.

Friendly correspondence was defined by Cowper as "talking upon paper," and his letters meet this definition exactly. It is however no "rambling, loose, disjointed chat." There is not a single letter of Cowper's that may not be taken away from all its surroundings and considered quite apart from the question of to whom it was written or the occasion that called it forth; it pleases simply as a work of art. Of course we are not inferring that his letters would not lose immensely were we left in ignorance of the circumstances under which they were written, or wholly unacquainted with the persons to whom they were addressed. It must be so with all really good letters, the personal element is always the chief charm. Still, were Cowper's letters deprived of all that, they enchant us as a highly finished production; gems of literary art polished by a rare æsthetic taste. By the exquisite English, by the refined and high-toned mind they reveal, they produce the same effect as a beautiful picture or a delightful melody. There is humour of a very enjoyable kind in these letters, though differing widely from the rampant fun that sparkles all through the correspondence of Lamb, or the laughable descriptions which abound in that of Tom Hood. It is rather a delicate aroma, the subtle perfume of wit, that breathes through the letters of Cowper, giving a delightful animation to the style, very rarely breaking into fun. In all, there is evidence of the chastened mind which, while it could burst forth into the mad drollery of John Gilpin, was more frequently subdued to the awful melancholy of the Castaway.

The solitary, semi-invalid life of the recluse of Olney afforded scant incident for the subject of correspondence. Yet how exquisitely are the commonplace objects of his home worked into the picture of his life in his letters to his dear friend and kinswoman, Lady Hesketh. Take as illustrations his descriptions of his cat and dog:—

> "I have a kitten, my dear, the drollest of all droll creatures that ever wore a cat's skin. Her gambols are not to be described, and would be incredible if they could. In point of size, she is likely to be a kitten always, being extremely small of her age, but time I suppose, that spoils everything, will make her also a cat. You will see her I hope before that melancholy period shall arrive, for no wisdom that she may gain by experience and reflection hereafter will compensate the loss of her present hilarity. She is dressed in a tortoise-shell suit, and I know you will delight in her."
>
> "My dog, my dear, is a spaniel. He was the property of a farmer and had been accustomed to lie in the chimney corner among the embers till the hair was singed off his back and nothing left of his tail but the gristle. Allowing for these disadvantages, he is really handsome; and when Nature shall have furnished him with a new coat, a gift which in consideration of the ragged condition of the old one it is hoped she will not long delay, he will then be unrivalled in personal endowments by any dog in the country. He and my cat are excessively fond of each other, and play a thousand gambols together it is impossible not to admire."

All the little interests that made up the daily life of the poet become the property of his correspondents. His tame hares, the very disposal of the furniture of his house, even the wonderful leech he kept in a bottle that "foretells all the prodigies and convulsions of nature and in point of the earliest and most accurate intelligence is worth all the barometers in the world;" all find their way into his letters to his intimate friends. It is in this respect he shows how thoroughly he understood the object of friendly communing, which is to give our friends a share in our lives—to make them free of our individual world. In a very different strain is the last letter he ever penned, written to an intimate friend, about a biography he had been reading:—

> "If the book afforded me any amusement, or suggested any reflections, they

> were only such as served to embitter still more the present moment by a sad retrospect of those days when I thought myself secure of an eternity to be spent with the spirits of such men as he whose life affords the subject of it. But I was little aware of what I had to expect, and that a storm was at hand which in one terrible moment would darken and in another still more terrible blot out that prospect forever."

The dark cloud of religious melancholy which had shrouded his life enfolded him in its gloomy drapery to the close. The Olney correspondence may be said to have inaugurated a new epoch in the art of letter-writing. Prior to that time the stately epistles of Pope and his school were the models of elegant correspondence. It is doubtful whether any but inveterate bookworms read the letters of Pope and his contemporaries now. Even those of the sprightly Lady Mary Wortley Montague, fine as they are, have lost much of their interest now that the world, by means of ready locomotion, has become so much smaller than it used to be. A lady residing at Constantinople is no longer dwelling in a remote country, amongst an unknown people. Her occupation of writing full and graphic descriptions of manners and customs in foreign lands is pretty well usurped in these days by special correspondents. Even Horace Walpole's witty and vivacious style cannot redeem, in the opinion of our more earnest age, the triviality of the events he loves to chronicle. Macaulay says of him, that such was the conformation of his mind, that small things appeared great to him and great things small. It may be this very quality that gives much of the undoubted charm to his brilliant gossipy letters. His account of a shock of earthquake felt in London is an example of this, for its chief interest is in the sarcastic allusions to the conduct of the fashionable world on the occasion.

> "We have had a second shock more violent than the first, and you must not be surprised if by next post you hear of a burning mountain sprung up in Smithfield. In the night between Wednesday and Thursday last, the earth had a shivering fit between one and two. On a sudden I felt my bolster lift up my head, I thought somebody was getting from under my bed, but soon found it was a strong earthquake, that lasted near half a minute, with a violent vibration and great roaring. I got up and found people running into the streets, but saw no mischief done: there had been some; two old houses flung down, several chimneys and much chinaware. Several people are going out of town, for it has nowhere reached above ten miles from London. They say they are not frightened, but that it is such fine weather, 'Lord! one can't help going into the country!' A parson who came into White's the morning of the earthquake, heard bets laid whether it was an earthquake or a blowing up of powder mills, went away exceedingly scandalised, and said, 'I protest they are such

> am impious set of people, I believe if the last trumpet were to sound, they would bet puppet-show against Judgment.
>
> "All the women in the town have taken the earthquakes on the foot of judgments; and the clergy, who have had no windfalls of a long season, have driven horse and foot into this opinion. Several women have made earthquake gowns, that is, warm gowns to sit out of doors all night. These are of the more courageous. One woman, still more heroic, is come to town on purpose. She says all her friends are in London and she will not survive them. But what will you think of Lady Pelham, Lady Arundel, and Lord and Lady Galway, who go this evening to an inn ten miles out of town (the next shock having been confidently foretold for to-night), where they are to play at brag till five in the morning and then come back—I suppose to look for the bones of their husbands and families under the rubbish."

We are informed by statisticians that the average duration of life is longer now than it was a hundred years ago. Yet there is nothing strikes one more forcibly on getting a glimpse of manners and customs of that date than that everyone found life so long as to have great difficulty in filling up its redundant leisure. Of course the reason is, there was much less that was absolutely necessary to be done in those days than in these. The whole duty of man was comprised under fewer heads. One of these heads undoubtedly was epistolary correspondence, the art of expressing correct sentiments in well rounded periods. Most of us have read in Thackeray's pleasant essay of the correct little letter, with all its i's properly dotted and t's neatly crossed, written by the Princess Charlotte of Mecklenburgh Strelitz, which won for her the English throne. It was filled with the merest platitudes about the horrors of war and the blessings of peace, but it brought the well-meaning unintelligent young King of England to her feet. The most exalted sentiments, expressed in the choicest language, pall after a time; and as Sydney Smith said even of the brilliant Madame de Sévigne's letters, "Twelve volumes full of pretty conceits become fatiguing." Lady Mary Wortley Montague is scarcely amenable to the charge of sentimentalism. A letter written to her lover, in which she consents to elope with him, would certainly have been improved by a little infusion of that delicious, impalpable something which Pope and his school extol as sentiment. It is somewhat of a shock, and jars upon our sense of the fitness of things, to find a young lady capable of so romantic a stratagem as an elopement planning the details with business-like finish, and giving utterance to such extremely common-sense views about marriage as we find in this letter.

> "Reflect now for the last time in what manner you must take me. I shall

come to you with only a night-gown and petticoat, and that is all you will get by me. I told a lady of my friends what I intend to do, she proffered to lend us her house. I did not accept of this till I let you know. If you think it more convenient to carry me to your lodgings, make no scruple of it. Let it be where it will, if I am your wife I shall think no place unfit for me where you are. I beg to leave London next morning, wherever we go. I should wish to go out of England, if it suits your affairs. I again beg you to have a coach to be at the door early next Monday morning. If you determine to go to the lady's house you had best come with a coach and six at seven o 'clock to-morrow. Do in this what you like, but after all think very seriously. You can show me no goodness I shall not be sensible of. However, think again and resolve never to think of me if you have the least doubt, or it is likely to make you uneasy in your fortune. I believe to travel is the most likely way to make a solitude agreeable and not tiresome; remember you have promised it. 'Tis something odd for a woman that brings nothing to expect anything, but after the manner of my education I dare not pretend to live, but it some degree suitable to it. I had rather die than return to a dependency upon relations I have disobliged. Save me from that fear, if you love me. If you cannot or think I ought not to expect it, be sincere and tell me so. 'Tis better I should not be yours at all, than for a short happiness involve myself in ages of misery."

There is little of the self-immolating impulse of youthful passion here that is willing to give all for love and the world well lost! A similar common-sense view of things as they are distinguishes a letter of Lord Byron's, written at a parallel crisis in his life, viz., when on the eve of marriage. A certain glamour of romance, and disposition to look at all things through rose-coloured spectacles, is popularly supposed to attend this eventful period; yet we find such amiable illusion conspicuous by its absence in the case of a young lady who was sufficiently romantic to consent to elope, and a poet who has sung *la grande passion* in all its phases, with an energy of feeling quite unsurpassed.

"Dear Lady—Your recollection and invitation do me great honour, but I am going to be married and cannot come. My intended is 200 miles off, and the moment my business here is arranged, I must set off to be happy. Miss Milbanks is the good-natured person who has undertaken me, and, of course, I am very much in love, and as silly as all single gentlemen must be in that sentimental situation. I have been accepted these three weeks; but when the event will take place I don't exactly know. It depends partly upon lawyers, who are never in a hurry. One can be sure of nothing; but at present there seems to be no other interruption to this intention, which seems as mutual as possible, and now no secret, though I did not tell first, and all our relations are congratulating away to right and left in the most fatiguing manner You perhaps know the lady. She is niece to Lady Melbourne, and has no fault, except being a great deal too good for me, and that I must pardon if nobody else should. It might have been two years ago, and if it had, would have saved me a world of trouble. She has employed the interval in refusing about half-a-dozen of my particular friends (as she did me once, by the way), and has taken me at last; for which I am very much obliged to her. I wish it was all well over, for I hate bustle, and there is no marrying without some; and then I must not marry in a black coat, they tell me, and I can't bear a blue one. Pray forgive me for scribbing all this nonsense. You know I must be serious all the rest of my life, and this is a parting piece of buffoonery, which I write with tears in my eyes, expecting to be agitated. Believe me, most seriously and sincerely your obliged servant, BYRON."

Dr. Johnson has left one letter on record which is interesting as marking an epoch in English literature, the end of the era of patronage. It points to the advent of a brighter day alike for readers and writers. It shows that there was growing up in England an intelligent public, to whom henceforth the man of letters was to look as alike the object of his labours and the arbiter of his reward. It may be said patronage died about this time, and this letter of the famous doctor is the inscription on its grave. The period through which Dr. Johnson lived was rife with change, political, social, and religious, of which none probably was more marked or more beneficial to the cause of progress than this rise in the status of the literary profession. There is nothing Johnsonian in the phraseology of the letter. It is a model of fine, nervous English, fitly expressing a manly dignified rejection of the assistance that came too late, that sought to share the glory of a well-earned success, though it had smoothed no step in the rugged path to fame.

"February 7th, 1876.

"My Lord,—I have been lately informed that two papers, in which my dictionary is recommended to the public, were written by your lordship. To be so distinguished is an honour which, being little accustomed to favours from the great, I know not well how to receive or in what terms to acknowledge. Seven years have now passed since I waited in your outward rooms, or was repulsed from your door, during which time I have been pushing on my work through difficulties, of which it is useless to complain, and have brought it at last to the verge of publication, without one act of assistance, one word of encouragement, or one smile of favour. Such treatment I did not expect, for I never had a patron before. Is not a patron, my lord, one who looks with unconcern on a man struggling for life in the water, and when he has reached ground, encumbers him with help? The notice which you have been pleased to take of my labours, had it been early, had been kind; but it has been delayed till I am indifferent and cannot enjoy it; till I am solitary, and cannot impart it; till I am known, and do not want it. I hope it is no very cynical asperity not to confess obligations where no benefit has been received, or to be unwilling that the public should consider me as owing that to a patron which Providence has enabled me to do for myself. Your obedient servant, "SAMUEL JOHNSON."

Poets seem as a rule to possess the qualities that make a good letter-writer. Byron, Shelley, Keats, and others of the glorious band, who "learn in suffering what they teach in song," have enriched our literature with their letters.

The following letter of Robert Burns to a friend in Edinburgh after the poet's ill-starred visit to that city, reads like a presage of the wasted life, the golden promise of a brilliant day quenched in the night of an untoward fate.

"MY DEAR FRIEND,—I am now arrived safe in my native country, after a very agreeable jaunt, and have the pleasure to find all my friends well. I never, my friend, thought mankind very capable of anything generous; but the stateliness of the patricians in Edinburgh, and the servility of my plebeian brethren (who perhaps formerly eyed me askance) since I returned home have nearly put me out of conceit altogether with my species. I have bought a pocket Milton, which I carry perpetually about with me, in order to study the sentiments—the dauntless magnanimity, the intrepid unyielding independence, the desperate daring, and noble defiance of hardship, in that great personage, Satan. 'Tis true I have just now a little cash; but I am afraid the star that hitherto has shed its malignant purpose-blasting rays full in my zenith; that noxious planet so baneful in its influences to the rhyming tribe, I much dread it is not yet beneath my horizon. Misfortune dodges the path of human life; the poetic mind finds itself miserably deranged in, and unfit for the walks of business; add to all, that thoughtless follies and hair-brained whims, like so many *ignes fatui*, eternally diverging from the right line of sober discretion, sparkle with step-bewitching blaze in the idly-gazing eyes of the poor heedless bard, till, pop! "he falls like Lucifer, never to hope again." God grant this may be an unreal picture with respect to me! but should it not, I have very little dependence on mankind. "ROBERT BURNS."

Most of us have suffered in the course of our lives from that refined torture of modern civilisation—letters of condolence. Kind souls have written to express sympathy with us in trouble or bereavement, but their sympathy has been expressed in so circumstantial, so painfully realistic a way, that we feel as if a hand was drawn accross the wrenched and quivering nerves. The commonplaces, the mere platitudes of consolation have been thrown like drops of iced water on to our burning sorrow, and returned as vapour with the sharp hiss of agony. How different to the ordinary rasping process of such epistles is the delicately expressed sympathy of the following letter of Burns, to a friend in recent bereavement Here the mourner is not reminded of the terrible isolation of personal sorrow, but tenderly gathered into the fellowship of suffering.

"Dear Mrs. Dunlop,—What shall I say to comfort you, my much-valued, much-afflicted friend? I can but grieve with you; consolation, I have none to offer, except that which religion holds out to the children of affliction—*children of affliction*—how just the expression! Like every other family, they have matters among them which they hear, see, and feel, in a serious all-important manner, of which the world has not, nor cares to have, any idea. Who would wish for many years? What is it but to drag existence until our joys gradually expire, and leave us in a night of misery; like the gloom which blots out the stars one by one from the face of night, and leaves us without a ray of comfort in the howling waste! "ROBERT BURNS."

There is probably no writer who has left the stamp of his unique personality on his letters so completely as Charles Lamb. His tiny notelets, as he used to call them, need no signature to trace them to the whimsical Elia. To a musical friend he writes—

"Dear Novello,—My sister's cold is as obstinate as an old Handelian whom a modern player is trying to convert to Mozartism. As company must and always does injure it, Emma and I propose to come to you in the evening of to-morrow instead of meeting here. An early bread-and-cheese supper at half-past eight will oblige us. I sign with a black seal that you may begin to think her cold has killed Mary, which will be an agreeable unsurprise when you read this.

"CHARLES LAMB."

In the subjoined to a friend who asked permission to take his portrait, we find allusion to the dread trouble of his life, allusion made in his own brief way, pointing but for a moment, and incidentally as it were, to the black cloud of sorrow and care that gave a background of deep pathos to the common-places of his life and afforded even to the brilliancy of his wit a Salvator Rosa depth of contrast.

"Dear Hunt,—I am here in the eleventh week of the longest illness my sister ever had, and no symptoms of amendment.

"As to my head, it is perfectly at your service; I should be proud to hang up as an alehouse sign even, or rather I care not about my head or anything but how we are to get well again, for I am tired out. God bless you and yours from the worst calamity. "CHARLES LAMB."

To a friend who had sent him a hare, he returns this characteristic note of thanks—

"Dear Sir,—The hairs of our head are numbered, but those which emanate from your heart defy arithmetic. I would send longer thanks, but your young man is blowing his fingers in the passage. Yours gratefully,

"CHARLES LAMB."

It would lengthen this article beyond all limits even to refer to each of the brilliant letter-writers whose published correspondence forms a complete picture of literary society in the beginning of the present century.

Sydney Smith's genial humour, overflowing on every subject, makes him one of the most delightful of letter-writers. Even a serious illness affords subject for a joke, when he writes to a friend describing his emaciated state as giving him the appearance of having had two middling sized curates taken out of him: "If you see sixteen or seventeen pounds of flesh anywhere about they belong to me." His best and wittiest letters were those which brightened the home circle during his occasional absence; eagerly looked for, we are told, and fully appreciated by the young folks, the only obstacle to their complete enjoyment was the singularly illegible writing. Passages would sometimes defy every effort to decipher them, and have to be cut out and returned to the writer for explanation, frequently to be found unreadable by him. "I can never engage to read my own handwriting after twenty-four hours," was the answer he returned to one of these applications. We think, however, with Leigh Hunt, that in a letter written for the sake of giving pleasure no pains should be spared even in the minor point of caligraphy. Another genial writer, who did not overlook the great source of pleasure to children that a kindly pleasant letter may be, was Tom Hood, and he added to the gracious act by the kindly considerateness of the way in which it was done. It is a kindness to write a letter to a child, but it is a loving-kindness to write it so large and clear that the child can read it without much help from others—and this Tom Hood would do. Frequently he would glide noiselessly into the room where the children were asleep, and place upon their pillows little notes containing humorous conceits or caricature sketches that the morning might begin with a hearty pleasant laugh, which would send its little rill of brightness through the day.

To one of his small friends he writes:—

"My Dear May,—I promised you a letter and here it is. I was sure to remember it; for you are as hard to forget as you are soft to roll down a hill with. What fun it was! only so prickly. I thought I had a porcupine in one pocket, and a hedgehog in the other. The next time before we kiss the earth we will have its face well shaved. Did you ever go to Greenwich Fair? I should like to go there with you, for I get no rolling at St. John's Wood. Tom and Fanny only like roll and butter, and as for Mrs. Hood, she is for rolling in money. Tell Dannie that Tom has set his trap in the balcony and has caught a cold, and tell Jeanie that Fanny has set her foot in the garden, but it has not come up yet. Oh! how I wish it was the season when "March winds and April showers bring forth May flowers," for then of course you would give me another pretty little nosegay. Besides, it is frosty and foggy weather, which I do not like. The other night, when I came from Stratford, the cold shrivelled me up, so that when I got home, I thought I was my own child. Give my love to everybody, from yourself down to Willie, with which and a kiss, I remain up hill and down dale, Your affectionate lover, "THOMAS HOOD."

The following, written from his death-bed to the then Premier of England, is characteristic of him who sang the song of the shirt—

"Dear Sir,—We are not to meet in the flesh. Given over by my physicians and by myself, I am only kept alive by frequent instalments of mulled port wine. In this extremity I feel a comfort, for which I cannot refrain from again thanking you with all the sincerity of a dying man, and at the same time bidding you a respectful farewell. Thank God my mind is composed and my reason undisturbed, but my race as an author is run. My physical debility finds no tonic virtue in a steel pen, otherwise I would have written one more paper—a forewarning one—against an evil, or the danger of it, arising from a literary movement in which I have had some share, a one-sided humanity, opposite to that catholic, Shakesperian sympathy which felt with king as well as peasant, and duly estimated the mortal temptations of both stations. Certain classes at the poles of society are already too far asunder; it should be the duty of our writers to draw them nearer by kindly attraction, not to aggravate the existing repulsion and place a wider moral gulf between Rich and Poor, with hate on the one side and fear on the other. But I am too weak for this task, the last I had set myself; it is death that stops my pen, you see, and not the pension.

"God bless you, sir, and prosper all your measures for the benefit of my beloved country. I have the honour to be, sir, yours,

"THOMAS HOOD."

There is a numerous class of correspondents who, if they go a little excursion, make a duty of rivalling the local guide-books in the descriptions of every spot through which they happen to pass. Such details are extremely wearisome to write, with conscientious fidelity, and to the average reader, whose imagination is not active enough to fill in the whole panorama, they fail to convey any real picture of the locality. In a letter of the poet Keats, we find a burlesque of this style. It is written from moist but lovely Devonshire.

"DEAR REYNOLDS,—Buy a girdle, put a pebble in your mouth, loosen your braces, for I am going amongst scenery. I'll cavern you and grotto you, and wood you and water you, and immense-rock you, and tremendous-sound you, and solitude you. I'll make a lodgment on your glacis by a row of pines, and storm your covered ways with bramble bushes. I'll have at you with hip and haw small shot, and cannonade you with shingles. I'll be witty upon salt fish, and impede your way with clotted cream. . . . I have seen a pretty valley, pretty cliffs, pretty brooks, pretty meadows, pretty trees, all standing as they were created, and blown down as they were not created. This green is beautiful—pity that it is amphibious, but alas! the flowers here wait as naturally for the rain twice a day as the muscles do for the tide; so we look upon a brook in these parts as you do upon a splash in your country. This Devonshire is like Lydia Languish, very entertaining when she smiles, but cursedly given to sympathetic moisture. . . . You know enough of me to tell the places where I haunt most, so that if you think for five minutes after having read this you will find it a long letter, and see written in the air before you, your affectionate friend, "JOHN KEATS."

That we should seek to give our friends some idea of the *locale* in which we may be temporarily sojourning is but natural. It is against the minuteness of wearisome detail that we protest, that every summer wanderer in Tasmania should feel bound to tell us the exact height of Mount Wellington, or to describe the fan-like growth of the Tasmanian beech.

The most recent school of letter-writers may be said to err in the direction of being too impersonal. The subjects in which all educated people are interested have so increased in number that it is easy to write a letter that shall be interesting in itself, yet may be sent indifferently to any correspondent. Such productions, however entertaining or clever they may be, lack the essential characteristic of a good letter—strong personal interest.

It is related of Margaret Fuller, the well-known American, that during her temporary residence in Europe, she corresponded with over a hundred people. Frequently she would write a short review of a book she had been reading and post it indiscriminately to one or other of these numerous correspondents. However valuable her literary criticisms may have been, intimate friends would feel something like receiving a stone for bread, when instead of the personal communion of a friendly letter they were favoured with a review. Literary judgments or a statement of political or religious opinions may with excellent effect be woven into a letter, but for letters to consist mainly of such renders them tedious, however ably written. In a friend's letter we need first of all the sense of the writer's personality. We want to feel the presence of the real living, thinking, feeling self, and not to have the dry bones of the mere framework of his intellectuality rattled in our faces. As an instance of the impersonal letter which is becoming increasingly usual, we have permission to quote from one recently received from an adjacent colony. The writer, a lady, is evidently possessed of considerable culture and ability. She discourses at large upon a subject of vital interest, yet the letter, though addressed to an intimate friend, bears no impress of the writer's character, while inspiring us with a very high respect for her intellect:—

"How can you see what men are, and how they have become so, and hold man to be a free agent? If he inclines to the bad the balance is not even, and he is not free, because he did not choose what inclination he would have. These are matters chiefly of constitution; secondly, of surroundings; neither of which he was able to influence. Just bear this in mind when you find out a person's history; I am sure you will quite give up the Free-will notion in time. . . . By-and-by I think you will be less sure about conscious immortality, when you have read and thought more about the qualities most likely to be imperishable. . . . What if these convolutions of grey matter that form the substance of the brain, are really separate organ-keys on which the vital force pressing firmly here or touching lightly there, played the grand harmony of intellect? What if *this* key was struck so strongly and so often it went out of tune, and others never touched grew stiff and silent with disuse? What if the little vessels in one special part were overcharged, and that part was given for a time the strange strength which fever or delirium gives a sick man? The feverish stage passes, and the man is prostrate, his muscles flaccid, his nerves unstrung. Admit all this would point to, and you are no nearer solving the mystery as to *Who plays the organ?* It is not I. I am the instrument to be used and laid aside—sometimes grand, sometimes mean, perfect or faulty. What is that which I have called Vital Force, which must be Eternal, for the music never ceases (though thousands of instruments be destroyed in a day), which must be Omnipresent (for it pervades uncounted millions in countless spheres), which must be Progressive (for even *we* ephemera note how the instruments improve), but which is not perhaps Almighty, for it is conditioned. It cannot play the instrument when that instrument *will not work.* When—

"Decay's effacing fingers
Have swept the lines where
Beauty lingers."

Is decay then an opposing force?—the Devil to our God? No—certainly, for it is negative, not positive—just the resolving into constituent elements—just chemical, not spiritual like that other one. Then what are these affections which we so desire to be immortal? Oh! perhaps they are only chords, struck in unison, vibrating delightfully, a duet where, on two instruments in perfect tune, is played the Grand March. Then I the instrument must perish? Yes, unless I can so incorporate myself with the Player that I can be one with Him. But as I know even less of His nature than I do of my own, it is quite impossible to say whether or how 'He may dwell in me and I in Him.' Yet this is not impossible. Suppose it were so, what do I gain? Ask rather what I leave behind for ever with this 'fair dwelling though it be but clay?' All that seems to be myself—the memory of all the grand, the sad, or the joyous airs He has played in me, yet stay; these must have been *in* Him or He could not have played them, and if part of Him they must be Eternal too. What then would be left behind? The framework, the covering, the pipes, the wires—yes, and I do not regret these any more than I should wish to keep a finger that had been cut off. Both must decay. Then what am I? A part of God that had no pre-existence till I began to think, but which can have no end? If I can only be eternal by being part of God, then my only means of becoming immortal is to be *unselfish*. If I cling to the earthy I shall perish with the earthy. If out of myself I become incorporate with God, I as a part of Him shall exist for ever. Have I then free choice? No, some were made for honour and some for dishonour. Some can dimly see the way, others are born blind—was it at their choice? But this is the old notion of Predestination. Then, may be, there is a grain of truth in the old doctrine after all. And would this be just? Well, what do you mean by justice? Perfect equality perhaps, meting to all an equal measure? That cannot be, because capabilities differ. Shall the rose complain that it is not an oak, or the moss that it is not like wheat, the nations' food? Shall the worm say it is unjust that it is not a horse, or the horse complain that it has not the understanding of a man? 'And to every seed his own body.' Then what do we mean by justice? That each pint pot shall hold a pint and every acorn have the qualities of an acorn. Then no more is expected of us than our natures are capable of, and surely this is true justice. Then some of us can see as through a glass, darkly, and some of us can learn to be unselfish, and the gift of God is Eternal life to those who can dwell in Him and He in them. And what is the effect of being perfectly unselfish? One would no longer crave to be oneself; one would rather be a part of God. With Him can be left—ah! so easily—all the burden of the vast To Be—all that is to happen before or after what we call Death."

It is a hopeful sign of the times that people freely give expression to thoughts such as these, and yet a more patent sign of the progress of education that they have such thoughts to express. Such impersonal utterances infinitely transcend in interest the small and arid topics that make up the *personnel* of too many of us. To some minds, the speaking out of these deep things is the only true communion of mind.

While thought continues to feel after kindred thoughts with which to blend, and feeling needs the refreshment that fellow-feeling alone can give, we believe the interchange of friendly letters will continue to hold a high rank amongst the minor pleasures of life.

MARTHA TURNER.

THE MELBOURNE UNIVERSITY.

To the first number of the *Melbourne Review* I contributed an article on the subject of the Teaching of History and Geography in Victoria. That article had the good fortune to receive very favourable treatment at the hands of reviewers in the newspaper press. Privately I have received many assurances of substantial agreement with the views advocated, both from persons engaged in education, and from those who are equally interested as parents or patriots. It is only fair to state that this feeling has not been unanimous; and as to a great extent opposition has risen from misapprehension or from incidental remarks, I venture to preface this, which forms a continuation of the former article, with an apology and an explanation.*

I am told that I seemed to depreciate Melbourne culture, in saying that what I called Dr. Freeman's fancies were unknown, or at least unhonoured in Melbourne. Very far be it from me to depreciate Melbourne culture. I really had seen, in Melbourne literature, instances of disregard of the Freeman canons. I spoke banteringly, it is true, but the banter was not directed against Melbourne. Secondly, I am said to have represented that Melbourne schools accepted cram, and the accusation even assumed the form (I blush to write it) that my remark was intended for an attack on brother public schoolmasters. I did and do maintain that the examination fosters cram, and that we schoolmasters are tempted to follow in the lines that the examination chalks out. Are not my critics a trifle thin-skinned? But whether they are or not, without yielding aught of the position maintained, I withdraw anything which can hurt the feelings of any individual. My care for the cause is too great for me to allow any expressions of mine to stand in the way. And if Melbourne schoolmasters are, as I think they are, on the same side, I would assure them that I have intentionally fired no shot against my allies.

It is very natural that men who have been long connected with the University of Melbourne should object to fault being found with its system. It is easier to criticise than it is to construct. They have borne the burden and heat of the day. I have just come from cooler climes, and have, perhaps, much of their coolness about me. It is possible, however, to bear willing testimony to the fact that the work done has been very good, in that the matriculation has raised the standard of education in the schools, yet to believe that this, as all human institutions, would be the better for criticism. Perhaps the very fact of my freshness on the scene is an argument in my favour as a critic. In one of his later books, Casimir Maremma, Sir Arthur Helps says that a new comer to a country should always write down his impressions of it within his first year. After that time he sees as the inhabitants see. As lookers on see most of a game, so a man fresh from England, especially if he has had some experience of kindred matters there, may be in a better position to suggest what he thinks improvements than those who invented or who have grown up under a local system. The University of Melbourne is worth criticising, because it is doing so much and such genuine work. It possesses great influence, and uses it well. It is the coping stone of our educational system. Surely it cannot be considered censorious to offer suggestions for improving so powerful an institution.

---

* NOTE.—One passage from Smith's History of Greece ought not to have been included in the list of passages cited in my last article, because it is accompanied by an explanatory illustration. But is it not needlessly technical?

A reaction against examinations is now influencing many minds. Powerful attacks have been made on the system in English magazines and newspapers, and controversy has followed. Doubtless there are abuses in the system. It has probably been extended too widely, and there may be some shadow of a reason for the fear that every post in the public service will some day be submitted to competition, as is said to be the case in China. *Medio tutissimus.* It is better neither, on the one hand, to appoint our mandarins by competition, nor, on the other, to sweep away the test of examinations altogether. The sting of the epithet "Chinese" surely attaches only to the abuse of examinations. There comes opportunely a recent story from Oxford. An able young man, who was frittering away his time in *dilettante* pursuits, is said to have told the master of his college that he thought the system of examinations was immoral. "I don't know," was the characteristic reply. "I don't know that examinations are immoral. I know that laziness is."

The changes, that have been made in England in the direction of giving appointments in the public service in that country and in India to the candidates who pass the best examination, have had a good effect on education. There has been a counterbalancing evil that the examinations have led to cramming. My own impression is that the cramming can be avoided, and the ablest men selected. If my opinion were valued by the Victorian Government, it would be given, with certain restrictions, in favour of throwing the Civil Service appointments open to competition.

At a conference of the head masters of first grade schools held in England last December, the following resolution was carried:—"The members of this conference having followed the careers of pupils who have been elected by open competition to scholarships at the Universities, or to appointments in the naval, military, or civil services of England or India, are of opinion that such competition, though in many cases urgently calling for improvements in detail, is on the whole good for the boys, for the schools, and for the country." This exactly represents the position for which I contend, viz., that the system of competition is good in principle, and that the obloquy which attaches to the system arises from faults in detail. It would perhaps be not out of place further to point out that the principle of appointment by competition is especially suited for a democracy, first, because it offers its careers to the ablest, not to the best born, nor the richest, nor the best befriended—*la carrière ouverte aux talents*; secondly, because it is a safeguard against a special danger of a democracy, the temptation to make political influence occupy the place of fitness as the basis of selection. Competition is not better than discrimination, if the heads of offices have time to exercise it. It is infinitely better than indiscriminate appointment, not to say than jobbery.

But I am more and more certain, as my experience grows fuller and riper, that great care is required in examination to defeat cram; that it is an evil to which the eyes of those who organise, and of those who examine, should be ever open; but that with such care duly exercised, examination is a fair general test of ability.

It would be a decided matter for regret if History and Geography were turned out of the ordinary school curriculum. Yet their warmest friends and most vigorous defenders must allow that they are the natural homes of Cram. Although that monster dire takes up its abode sometimes in other fields and finds pasturage elsewhere, these are the subjects which require most care to keep them free, partly from their very nature, partly from the force of their traditional teaching. Their truest friends hope for this care, but, failing the care, will welcome their exclusion from examination. Yet let no one think that cram cannot touch other subjects, such as language.

But first a misconception should be cleared out of the way. "What nonsense to speak against it at all: all education is cram," say some. "All learning by heart," say others. Pardon me. Learning poetry for repetition, whether in English or in a foreign language, as long as what is learned is understood, can by no means be regarded as cram. Rather it is the training of the memory, the storing it with treasure. The treasure may or may not remain unspent, the training is sure to be of value. Then again the learning of grammar by no means falls under the same condemnation as the learning of lists of dates or names. It consists either in the learning of laws, the application of which is soon and constantly demanded, or in the learning of forms which are constantly in request. Even irregular verbs have method in their irregularity. Those that rail at cram never say that the memory is not to be fed. We humbly ask for good food and digestible.

Cram in language is best represented by the learning by heart of a translation. In less degree, it is the reading over and over again the same book until its substance and many passages in it are known almost by heart. Reading is to make a full man, according to Lord Bacon, but this is the reading of various books and different authors. A constant repetition of a book of Cæsar, and a speech of Cicero, has only the effect of cloying the appetite and producing nausea. A curriculum for study should exhibit a considerable variety of authors, and should include some verse as well as prose. Even while these pages are passing through the press, I am delighted to find a change being made, some Homer taking the place of the eternal Xenophon, some Virgil sharing the ground with Cæsar.

May I be allowed, therefore, to plead either for the abolition of specified books for the matriculation examination, or for a free change in them. Books are now, in my humble judgment, retained for too long a period. Once before when this appeal was made by me, answer was made in an important paper: "If composition were demanded from candidates instead of translations, it is plain that only the pupils who have the good fortune to attend our best public schools would have a fair chance of passing."* *Non sequitur.* Why should not the language be taught in small or in private schools? Why should composition be regarded as the special preserve of public schools? Again, no one wishes to exclude translation, but that it should be from any suitable book, not from a particular text book. It may be urged that this would make the examination too hard, and be cruel to young boys. If it be remembered that the passage is unprepared, a different standard of accuracy would be adopted in the marking. At Eton and at Winchester boys of 12 and 14 are thus examined. This regulation published and proclaimed would be the making of the scholarship of the colony. And is it not one of the objects of the examination to encourage good teaching?

---

* *Argus*, Jan. 24, 1876.

Surely one of the elements that go to the making of a scholar, is a wide range of reading. All last year we who prepare or are being prepared for this examination were reading two treatises of Cicero. One of these, and by no means the more suitable of the two, together with a book of Cæsar, forms our bill of fare for next year. This is wearisome, but what is it to the English literature? Here we have had Milton's *Il Penseroso*, Gray's *Bard*, and Gray's *Progress of Poesy*, a total of 443 lines. It is very noble poetry. It is excellent school reading, well repaying study. But the finest poetry, the best reading, will hardly stand the test of being repeated and being made the basis of questions week after week for two years. Goldsmith's *Deserted Village*, and a few stanzas of Spenser, are down upon the list "to follow." May one be permitted to plead for a larger and a freer subject in English literature, and for a change at least once a year, for a play of Shakespeare, or, if that be thought too hard, for a poem of Scott, or an essay of Macaulay. I am by no means without hope in making this appeal, for the introduction of a text-book like Abbott and Seeley, which requires thought, and which is unpopular accordingly, shows that it is sought to keep this section free from the fascinations of cram. It may be worth while also to state that English analysis defies cram as long as the passages to be analysed are not selected from books previously announced.

When English literature was first admitted into the curriculum of schools, there was doubt and difficulty about its treatment. Some went back to archaic English, because modern English was too easy, and selected such books as the Ayenbyt of Inwyt and the Vision of Piers Plowman. Some took to Etymology. But English literature is studied in order that Englishmen may know something of the great masterpieces which that literature possesses, and which make it the noblest in the world. In classical schools, boys in their classical work are puzzling over words and sentences: they come to English that they may be taught to appreciate ideas. After 20 lines of Ovid, they read 200 of Scott, that they may change the method of considering from the small to the large scale.

If the liberty suggested with respect to subjects be considered too great for matriculation, could it not be conceded at least to the matriculation exhibitions? The matriculation examination was once the dividing line between school and University. It was arranged as an examination for boys leaving school, like the German *Abiturienten Examen.* But as the standard was not so high as the highest work done in the schools, it became a practice for the best boys to pass the matriculation as soon as possible and then return to the schools. The fact that the examination at the end of the first year was more than a year's work ahead also made this advisable. The schools then wanting a gauge for their highest work, found what they wanted in the exhibition examinations. But those who wished to keep education at a high level would have been wise to have aimed at making these exhibitions as hard to obtain as scholarships at Oxford or at Cambridge. They would then have set unprepared pieces for translation, composition and grammar. But no! the old fetters are retained. Actually the very books in which the candidates may have passed years before, or their counterparts are required with additions.

Why not try the free system here? I would venture to suggest the following modifications of the present system:—Say for the classical exhibition, that the examination will be in Latin and Greek, and let the best scholar win, not the most industrious getter up of stated books. For the English exhibition let the subjects be stated, the histories of certain countries, geography, and a play or two of Shakespeare. Allow both French and German to be taken up, not as at present only one. It would indeed be better, if funds permitted, to sever these subjects, and create a fourth or Modern Language Exhibition. Then as a make-weight in the English, the writing of an essay might be added: and the two modern languages would be regarded as a balance for the two ancient. The standard of the subjects for the mathematical exhibition has been considerably increased lately, and quite rightly. This would surely be a good opportunity to make some alterations in the arrangements for the others.

At the risk of depriving this paper of symmetry by introducing matter seemingly foreign to its proper subject, may I be permitted to add a few words upon the examinations of the University generally? But in so doing I should particularly wish it to be understood that there is no personal allusion, but that I am contending for a principle. It is essential to eliminate the personal element. I venture to lay down three propositions with respect to the conduct of examinations:—

1. An examiner should examine as far as possible proportionately from all parts of his subject.
2. No man should examine in the subject which he has taught.
3. A board is better than an individual examiner.

1. The first proposition would seem to be almost an axiom. It would hardly seem fair that one portion of a subject should be selected almost by chance, and all the questions be asked upon it, whereas other large parts are left untouched, though they may have been the subject of hard work to the examinee. It would be easy to illustrate, but invidious. It is advisable to eliminate chance.

2. A phrase, not of my invention, has been used to express the violation of this canon. It has been called "auditing one's own accounts." This term was used at Oxford merely of the appointment of examiners from the teaching staff, although it is a rigorous rule there, not only that a man should never examine any one who had been his pupil, but not even a man of his own college. There are always more examiners than one, always out of different colleges. In the interests of the professors and lecturers, as much as of the general public, it seems advisable that their work should be tested from without, and probably no one would welcome the introduction of a change so much as the professors themselves. The professors would thus be released, and would obtain more time for their true work of teaching. If the professor examined only his own class, then he loses the test of an independent examiner; the examinees also lose it. It is almost impossible for him to lay aside impressions that he has formed in class, and decide by the examination only. If others are examined who have not had the advantage of belonging to his class, the result is still more unequal. Even in school examinations the rule proposed is adopted as far as possible, and a man will hand over the form he has taught to another to examine. This is certainly the practice at the best English schools. And at the University a change has already been made in the Law Faculty. May I particularly recommend the example of those learned in the law to their brethren in Arts?

3. The gravity of the consequences that often attach to examinations seems to make this last rule of importance. If there is any chance of the plan of competition being introduced for Civil Service appointments, a new and almost a monetary value being

attached to success, it is to be hoped that the Government will add this proviso, so that no man may ever be able to complain that his interests were sacrificed to a crotchet or a whim. It would place Cæsar's wife far above suspicion.

The Oxford practice with respect to a board of examiners has been already stated. If there are four examiners, and one of them is a Balliol man, when Balliol men come forward, they fall into the hands of the other examiners. The examiner does not vote on the question whether men of his own college shall pass, or into what class they shall be placed. Cambridge etiquette is similar. When a man is appointed examiner, he at once gives up his pupils who are preparing for that Tripos. In Dublin, until lately, the practice was the same as now at Melbourne. But a change similar to that here advocated, namely, the substitution of a jury for a judge, was demanded by public opinion, and the demand was so strong that it could not be resisted.

It may be objected that this change would greatly increase the amount of work, if it required that all papers even of candidates for matriculation be submitted to more than one examiner. What is this but multiplying the labour of the examiners by the figure at which it be decided to place the board? But it would satisfy the demands of the case if the questions were set jointly, and if the board arranged the scale on which answers should be marked. Papers are set in this way by committees in the local examinations at home. A distinction should also be drawn between pass and honour examinations. It would be naturally more necessary that the judgments of different examiners should be obtained on the latter.

But I hear triumphantly asked, whence can this increase of examiners be procured? Even if the teaching body be admitted as a part of the board, whence the other examiners? The first answer should be, not from among the schoolmasters, or, at any rate, not from the schoolmasters alone. There are obvious reasons why it would be as unwise to select the examiners from them as to continue the present practice. But there are men in Melbourne, especially amongst the younger barristers, and amongst those who have recently taken degrees, from whom a moderating element might without difficulty be found. It would be easy, and not expensive, to procure assistance from England. A tour of the world has fascinations for so many men that the promise of certain work of this kind at this end of the world, without very high remuneration, would tempt many a fellow of a college to spend a year or two with us. But if pressed still further, I proceed to play my last card. It is a suggestion made in all good faith; and I must tender an apology to what I consider the importance of the idea for introducing it thus at the fag end of an article, and not devoting to it an article by itself.

There are those who doubt whether each of the Australian colonies can fairly support a University; whether it would not have been better to have made a common Australian University, with colleges at Sydney, Melbourne, Adelaide, and at any other town where the Government was prepared to establish a sufficient staff of professors. Under this arrangement the University alone would have the power to grant degrees, and would hold examinations at the different colleges for that purpose. Thus teaching would go on at different centres, but the results of their work would be compared, and a healthy rivalry stimulated. For an Australian statesman it would be an object worthy of ambition to create this union now. The value of a degree given by a united University would be much greater than that granted by one of its constituent parts; and for all purposes except the degrees, no change would be required. I can conceive only one or two objects more worthy of the statesman in these colonies; nor would the change require the power of an autocrat, but only the force, whatever it may be, that sways majorities. It is not too late. There is nothing depreciatory of the colony or of the University in this idea, because it is manifest to everyone that, in a matter of this sort, a young country cannot compete with an old country. In a young country man has to fight against the powers of nature—to conquer the earth and to subdue it. The domain of active life offers more exciting careers and better remuneration than the literary life. If Victoria had the same population as England, she could not expect to have universities with the same intellectual life. America has not. These arguments, similar to those which De Tocqueville makes with respect to culture in America, are humbly submitted to show, if anything were wanted to show, that a united university, such as has here been sketched, would be stronger and better, would have its degrees more valued, than any of the constituent universities as they now stand alone. Yet all honour is due to Melbourne for what she has achieved, for the intellectual flame that she has kept alive.

If this proposal be thought too wild, might not a federation of the three Universities of Sydney, Melbourne, and Adelaide, be formed for the purposes of examination? If a conference were held, and some slight alterations made in the curriculum, it would be possible, perhaps, to form a joint examining body, even whilst the Universities retained their separate existence, and gave their own degrees.

Why should such a system be found cumbrous or unworkable? These are days when communication is very easy. Sydney and Adelaide, though not so near that a parson with a horse could preach a sermon here in the morning and at one of them in the afternoon, are yet within easy reach. There are numerous and convenient steamers, and the post is frequent. It cannot be very long before the lines of railway are completed. Reliance can be placed upon the telegraph, and if there were any fear of breach of secrecy there are ways of telegraphing in cypher.

It may be said that the jealousy which is felt by one colony of another would be a sufficient bar to such a scheme as this. Surely it is the duty of educated men to show that they at least are superior to this petty feeling of local jealousy. If one argument more were wanted to support the proposal, it could be found herein, that in the union of the colonies for any purpose one step more is taken to that which is the day-dream of every statesman worth the name in Australia, the federation of the Australian colonies; for that in turn is but parcel of the wider scheme which occupies the minds of statesmen throughout the empire, the gathering together in one of all our fellow countrymen.

EDWARD E. MORRIS.

AUSTRALIAN POETRY.

THAT a prophet has no honour in his own country, is a proverb as true as it is old, and our colonial poets have found themselves no exception to the rule. A few cold words of recognition in the columns of the newspapers, and the admiration perhaps of a small circle of personal friends, are the only meed which those who have cultivated the muses in this country have hitherto received. Not only the "solid pudding," but the "empty praise" has been usually denied them, and yet there is no apparent cause for this neglect of our own poets. Colonial poetry, it will be admitted by those who have made its acquaintance, is neither inconsiderable in bulk, nor despicable as regards its quality. Some of our poets, indeed, have been thought worthy of very high praise by such English journals as the *Westminister Review*, the *Athenæum* and the *Spectator*. It cannot be said that the people of Australia are uncultured or deficient in admiration for poetry; on the contrary, the works of even second-rate English and American poets find a ready sale among us, and are eagerly perused. Such being the case, the almost universal neglect which Australian poets have met with in their own country must be attributable to that tendency in human nature to overlook the treasures which lie at our feet, and welcome with open arms anything which is far off. To whatever cause, however, we may attribute it, the fact is undoubted, that not one of our own poets has gained any pecuniary advantage by publishing his poems in the colonies; in most cases, indeed, a serious loss has been the result. It is further a fact, and one to be much deplored, that many of our best writers have, partly owing doubtless to that "cursed want of pence which vexes public men," and partly, to disappointment at the cold reception accorded to their efforts by the press and the public, been driven to desperate measures, and come to an ultimely end. Others, too, who were well fitted by nature to adorn the profession of literature, and who would have pursued that profession had they received a little of the sunshine of popular favour, have been compelled by necessity to devote their talents to earning their living in some other way, and thus the colonies have lost much of their best intellect. It is indeed the melancholy outcome of this state of things, that men peculiarly qualified by nature and education to perform work which none but they could perform, are thrust into the position of having to do work which hundreds and thousands of other people could do equally well. To see a man of talent and education discharging merely clerical and routine duties, reminds one of the hero of Mr. Brunton Stephens's excellent poem, the "Godolphin Arabian," performing the functions of a common cart-horse.

We are aware that it is the custom to say that this country is too young, and the population too small, to produce any original writers, and that we must wait several hundred years before we can expect a national literature to spring up. America is cited to prove how very slowly a young country developes a literature of its own. It is certainly true that America did not produce a single poet of note till within the present century. Even the war of independence, which should have had its Tyrtaeus or Körner, was barren of poetic genius, and Bryant, who is still alive, may be said to be the true father of American poetry. We think, however, that special and adequate causes can be assigned for this slow growth of American poetry—causes which are absent in these colonies. In the first place, at the time of the first settlements in America, literature was much less cultivated in Europe than it now is. The great dramatic epoch of literature had just dawned on England. That America, in its early youth, produced no great poet, is not to be wondered at when we consider the dearth of poetry which had existed in England from the time of Chaucer to that of Spenser and Shakspeare. The Skeltons, Lydgates, Gowers, and Occleves were, we suspect, only perused by antiquarians and professed literary men, even as early as in the time of Shakspeare. Certainly their hold on the public mind was very small. Such being the case, it is not surprising that America produced no poetry in the early years of its existence. Then again, the early settlers in America had scant time to "wander where the muses haunt." Their existence was passed in battling with the forces of nature, with wild beasts, and wilder men. The American colonist would be little inclined "to sport with Amaryllis in the shade," when a red Indian might at any moment put in a claim to Amaryllis' scalp. They were stern, rough men who settled America. Poetry was a luxury, and was not for them. A third and perhaps the most potent cause of the slow development of American poetry, was the Puritan influence. This cause has probably continued in operation almost to the present day. Those parts of America which arrived at a settled state earliest, and which would therefore be the first to produce a literature, were the parts where the Puritans, driven from England by the tyranny of James and Charles, settled in large numbers. In the minds of these men, poetry was associated with everything vile—with the profane and profligate lyrics of Herrick, Suckling, and Lovelace; with the licentious dramas of Beaumont and Fletcher; with the satire of Ben Jonson (who never spared the saints), with the cause of tyranny; and indeed with everything which they held in abhorrence. The poet would have met with little encouragement, if indeed he had not incurred actual risk, who should have ventured to publish his effusions in those parts of New England where the Puritans held sway. What damage these sectaries did to the drama, and indeed to literature generally, in England when they had the power, is too well known to need repetition here. The power they possessed in England was, however, but a faint reflection of the sway they exercised in New England. The non-existence of a copyright law was a serious hindrance to the early literary efforts of America, just as the absence of international copyright is now impeding the progress of American literature. Finally, the climate of America was one not at all propitious to the muses, while the features of nature—the vast forests, the mighty mountains and lakes—were on a scale calculated to dwarf and stunt the intellectual qualities of man, rather than to call them into fuller development. Now all these causes are absent in Australia. We live in an age when literature generally is cultivated with an ardour never before known. There has never been a time in the history of English literature, when poetry, even of an indifferent quality, has produced greater fame and emolument to its authors, than the present. This is proved by the vast number of second-rate poets that are now publishing in England, whose works command an extensive sale. Then again the progress of these colonies to a settled state has been more rapid than that of the American colonies was. From causes that could easily be indicated, a wealthy class has arisen in Australia at a comparatively early period of its existence. Poetry, as we have said before, is a luxury, and must be well paid for. A class of wealthy men is therefore required to foster it. The puritanical influence, though unhappily it exists in Australia to a limited extent, is too well under the control of an enlightened public opinion ever to prove a bar to the progress of literature. The majority of us do not believe that to be joyful is to be sinful, and that poetry is an emanation of the devil. The copyright laws apply to the colonies, and therefore our colonial writers are effectually protected in their competition with English writers. Finally, we possess a climate, and natural surroundings, well calculated to call into play the latent poetry of our nature. Our climate is very similar to that of the southern countries of Europe, where poetry seems to be the natural outcome of a lovely climate and a joyful temperament. The scenery in some parts of Australia, though beautiful and impressive, has not that sombre and forbidding grandeur which characterises the finest scenery of America and which seems to have rather an adverse influence on the human intellect. With reference to the smallness of our population, it should be remembered that the greatness of a nation in literature depends less on the number, than on the character, of its population. Attica, at the period of its greatest literary grandeur, when it was pouring forth a stream of poets, historians, and orators, possessed a population certainly not greater than that of Victoria at present. On the other hand, Russia may be adduced as a nation that, with an immense population, has been absolutely destitute of a literature of its own till quite recently. It will be admitted, we think, that the mental calibre of Australian colonists is not inferior to that of the natives of any European nation. The mere fact that many of them have left their birthplace, and traversed so many leagues of ocean to fight the battle of life in a new country, shows at any rate an amount of energy and courage which those who are content to remain in a state of inaction at home cannot lay claim to. Our colonial-born youths, whatever their faults may be, certainly display no falling off in mental capacity from the original stock. It would be easy to multiply arguments against the theory that Australia has not yet arrived at that stage in its development, at which it can be expected to produce a national poetic literature, but it is unnecessary. The stern logic of facts has already given the lie to any such theory. We have already produced several poets of whom no country need feel ashamed. To pass some of these under review, and to indicate, as far as possible in the necessarily brief space at our disposal, some of their most conspicuous merits and defects, is the object of this article.

The first poet who claims our attention is Mr. Henry Kendall, a native of New South Wales. His muse has unfortunately, so far, not been a prolific one. The best of his poems are to be found in a small volume, entitled "Leaves from Australian Forests." This volume, together with a few fugitive pieces scattered through the columns of various colonial periodicals, make up the sum total of his contribution to the literature of his native country. Mr. Kendall's forte is undoubtedly lyrical poetry; indeed he seldom attempts any other kind. His few narrative poems in blank verse, such as "A Death in the Bush" and "The Glen of Arramatta," are by no means among his happiest efforts. Not that these poems are destitute of merit, as both of them, the latter more especially, contain several fine passages; but, on the whole, they lack interest, and do not afford scope for Mr. Kendall's peculiar merits. The turn of the verse, and indeed of some of the expressions, remind us strongly of Tennyson's shorter pieces in blank verse; for instance, "Dora" and "Aylmer's Field." His great fault indeed seems to be a tendency to imitate previous poets. He reminds us, in some respects, of the mocking-bird of America, which can imitate exactly the note of every other songster. Unlike the mocking-bird, however, he possesses a natural note of his own, of which, unfortunately, he gives us too little. This imitative tendency is admitted by the poet himself in one of his sonnets, where he asks the reader of his poems to accept them kindly—

"Even though there be
Some notes that unto other lyres belong:
Stray echoes from the elder sons of song;
And think how from its neighbouring, native sea
The pensive shell doth borrow melody."

We think that this apology, although gracefully worded, will scarcely save the poet from the reader's condemnation, when he finds that in a volume of about 150 pages more than a third of the poems are imitations more or less close of other poets. Mr. Kendall's imitations, indeed, sometimes approach so nearly to the originals, as to be termed by the harsher name of plagiarisms. Take, for example, the first verse of "September in Australia"—

"Grey Winter hath gone, like a wearisome guest,
  And behold for repayment,
September comes on with the wind of the west,
  And the Spring in her raiment.
The ways of the frost have been filled of the flowers,
  While the forest discovers
Wild wings with the halo of hyaline hours,
  And a music of lovers."

And so on through seven or eight stanzas, pretty and musical enough, but just the sort of poetry that any man with a good ear could write by the ream, after a careful perusal of Swinburne's poems. Another fine poem, "Campaspe," is marred by the close imitation of Swinburne's glittering and somewhat meretricious verse—

"Turn from the ways of this woman! Campaspe we call her by name;
She is fairer than flowers of the fire, she is brighter than brightness of flame.
As a song that strikes swift to the heart with the beat of the blood of the South,
And a light and a leap and a smart, is the play of her perilous mouth;
Her eyes are as splendours that break in the rain at the set of the sun;
But turn from the ways of Campaspe—a woman to look at and shun!"

Take the following stanza from "Araluen"—

"But believe me, still my eyes
Often fill with light that springs
From divinity, which lies
Ever at the heart of things."

And again the following from one of his finest poems, that on "Charles Harpur"—

"And far and free, this man of men
With wintry hair and wasted feature,
Had fellowship with gorge and glen,
And learned the loves and runes of nature.

"Strange words of wind, and rhymes of rain,
And whispers from the inland fountains,
And mingled in his various strain
With leafy breaths of piny mountains.

"But as the under currents sigh
Beneath the surface of a river,
The music of humanity
Dwells in his forest-psalms forever.

"No soul was his to sit on heights
And live with rocks apart and scornful;
Delights of men were his delights,
And common troubles made him mournful."

Would not any student of Wordsworth, on having these stanzas read to him without being told who they were written by, at once declare they were by the author of "The Excursion." Not merely the ideas, but the very forms of expression seem to be borrowed from Wordsworth. Poe has also been laid under contribution in the poem entitled "The Last of his Tribe"—

"He crouches, and buries his face on his knees,
And hides in the dark of his hair;
For he cannot look up at the storm-smitten trees,
Or think of the loneliness there:
Of the loss and the loneliness there."

In this case Mr. Kendall has adopted throughout the whole poem, as a sort of refrain, the monotonous repetition which Poe employs in "Ulalume." It is one of the tricks of versification which the latter delights in employing; at best it is but a trick, and its sole merit in Poe is that he was the first to employ it. In Kendall it is simply a useless excrescence which deforms an otherwise fine poem, detracting from the reader's pleasure in perusing it. But perhaps the most unfortunate of all his imitations, and indeed the worst thing he ever wrote, is "After the Hunt," which reads like a miserable burlesque of "The Bells"—

> "Underneath the windy mountain walls
> Forth we rode an eager band,
> By the surges and the verges and the gorges,
> Till the night was on the land—
> On the hazy mazy land!
> Far away the bounding prey
> Leapt across the ruts and logs,
> But we galloped, galloped, galloped on,
> Till we heard the yapping of the dogs!
> The yapping and the yelting of the dogs."

It is almost incredible that a poet, with so exquisite an ear for the music of poetry as this poet possesses, should have deliberately printed in his collected poems such trash as this, which has the additional demerit of being vague and almost meaningless. Mr. Kendall is indeed a veritable chameleon of poetry, and reflects the colours of any poet he may have been recently studying. Another defect in his poetry, and a serious one, is the absence of all human interest, which characterises most of his poems. He is as a rule too purely descriptive. He writes beautifully about the sky, the flowers, the mountains, the birds, the winds, and the rivers, but he dissociates these things from human beings altogether, and seems to look at them as something apart and far off from the concerns of humanity. He does not even show how they affect his own mental moods. "The Hut by the Black Swamp" is a notable example of this. Here in a poem of seventy or eighty lines he describes a deserted hut in the bush. The treatment of the subject reminds one somewhat of Hood's "Haunted House." He tells us with great affluence of language and pomp of style that the moss never grows on the hut, the birds do not sing over it, the wild dog howls past it, the nettle entwines it, the adder makes his lair in it, and so on. Why? Because at some time or other a murder was committed there; but as to who committed the murder, who was the victim, what the circumstances were under which it was committed, or even how the poet himself is affected by the contemplation of it, we are left entirely in the dark. The last stanza is very characteristic :—

"For on this hut hath murder writ
With bloody fingers hellish things,
And God will never visit it
With flower, or leaf, or sweet-faced things,
Or gentle wings."

In fact, it is nature that is affected by human actions, and not man that is influenced by nature. A very similar idea occurs in "Ghost Glen":—

"To-night the north-easter goes travelling slowly,
But it never stoops down to that hollow unholy;
To-night it rolls loud on the ridges red-litten,
But it *cannot* abide in that forest sin-smitten."

Here the wind is personified, and human feelings attributed to it. Similarly in "September in Australia," "Euroclydon," "Arakoon," "The Warrigal," and other poems, nature is described from a purely objective stand-point by the poet. Throughout Mr. Kendall's poetry, indeed, nature is everything and man nothing. Indeed, he himself admits in so many words that he does not deal with human passions, and as we think he gives a good description of his own poetry, we shall quote the lines :—

"I purposed once to take my pen and write,
Not songs like some *tormented and awry*
With passion, but a cunning harmony
Of words and music caught from glen and height,
And lucid colours born of woodland light,
And shining places where the sea streams lie;"

But surely it is not necessary that poetry, describing human feelings and passions, should be "tormented and awry." This may be the case as regards the poetry of Swinburne and his school, but we should be sorry to think these poets the best exponents of human nature. Purely descriptive poetry, however beautiful, is apt to pall on one, if not connected with some human interest; the reader is "cloyed with sweetness." It is to be regretted that Mr. Kendall should have given us so few poems upon essentially colonial subjects. The title of his volume is "Leaves from *Australian* Forests." The reader will doubtless be somewhat puzzled to discover the connection between "Australian Forests" and such poems as "Daphne," "To Damascus," "A Spanish Love Song," "The Voyage of Telegonus," &c. Anyone who, after perusing these, turns to Mr. Kendall's poems on purely Australian subjects such as "Ghost Glen," "Illa Creek," "At Euroma," "On a Cattle Track," "Coogee," and "Sutherland's Grave," will perceive an essential difference between the two classes. The latter poems are almost perfect; as original as they are inimitable. The former, though well written and musical, are comparatively common-place, such as many second and third-rate poets in England could have written. Why should a colonial-born poet go out of his way to sing the well-worn story of "Daphne," and such other old world themes. But enough of censure. Let us now turn to the more pleasing duty of pointing out Mr. Kendall's merits. As a descriptive poet he stands easily first among colonial writers, while as a master of metre he will bear comparison with the best among English poets. His perfect command of all the technicalities of poetry—rhyme, alliteration, assonance—is something wonderful. Take the following:—

"May catch the sense like subtle forest spells."

"Nor comes the bird whose speech is song,
Whose songs are silvery syllables."

"Ah! in his life, had he mother or wife,
To wait for his step on the floor?
Did beauty wax dim while watching for him
Who passed through the threshold no more?
Doth it trouble his head? He is one with the dead;
He lies by the alien streams,
And sweeter than sleep is death that is deep,
And unvexed by the lordship of dreams."

"His should be a grave by mountains, in a cool and thick mossed lea,
With the lone creek falling past it, falling ever to the sea.
His should be a grave by waters, by a bright and broad lagoon,
Making steadfast splendours hallowed of the quiet shining moon."

Lines like these are perfect, and linger in the memory like strains of music, quite apart from the meaning they convey. It must be admitted, however, that Mr. Kendall seldom sacrifices the sense of a passage to its poetic form, as many great masters of metre do. He abounds also in those curiously felicitous expressions which are more than anything else characteristic of a genuine poet—passages in which not a word could be altered without spoiling the picture. Take the lines descriptive of the dog fastened outside in the storm, who—

"Stood, and set his great pathetic eyes,
In wind and wet, imploring to be loosed."

Or the following, where he describes how, in ruined forest vaults—

"Abide dim dark death featured owls
Like monks in cowls."

Or the following, where he describes how the summer moon

"Glides over the hills and floats and fills,
And dreams in the dark lagoon."

These passages are word pictures which could not possibly be improved on. A characteristic which must strike every reader of Mr. Kendall is his extreme melancholy. He fully exemplifies Shelley's line, "Our sweetest songs are those which tell of saddest thought." His best poems are full of a pensive sadness which would seem to be inspired by a contemplation of the Australian bush. Its vastness, its thick undergrowth, its monstrous trees, its desolation, its silence, all produce a depressing effect, which every one who has travelled through it must have observed, and are certainly not calculated to inspire one with light and cheerful musings. This vein of sadness is not peculiar to Mr. Kendall, but is apparent in Harpur, Gordon, and indeed all our poets who have passed much of their time in the bush. There is plenty of sweetness, but little "light" in Mr. Kendall's song. On the whole, however, he must be pronounced to be a true poet, though with a somewhat narrow scope. His best poem is undoubtedly "Ghost Glen." We regret that we have not space to extract it, for although it has been frequently quoted, it is well worthy of repetition. Had Mr. Kendall always written like this, praise and blame would have been alike thrown away upon him. As it is, we can only wish that he may live to give us many more poems of equal excellence.

Mr. J. Brunton Stephens is a Queensland poet, and one of whom that colony may well be proud. Though not equal as a descriptive poet, and a lyrist, to Mr. Kendall, he has the advantage of being more versatile than that poet. His muse ranges from "grave to gay, from lively to severe," and it is difficult to say in which kind of poetry he excels most. Mr. Stephens's most ambitious poem is entitled "Convict Once," and the subject, though a simple one, is skilfully and powerfully managed. The heroine is a woman who has been transported for some crime, of the nature of which we are not informed, and who, having completed the term of punishment, regains her freedom. The poet makes her describe herself subsequently as she stands before her mirror in the following lines:—

"Keener than ever, I fancy, the penetrant edge of my glance.
I can remember a fuller orbed cheek, and a rose blushing warmer;
But on my brow is no line sorrow furrowed, no wake of mischance.

Loves he dark tresses, I wonder, in sinuous subtlety twining?
Loves he dark eyes, fired with love, and star sympathied passion of night?
Loves he the long drooping eye-lash, half secret, half story combining?
Loves he the lithe grace of undulous ease and imperial height?

This is the reflex of beauty I gaze on."

Thus possessed of beauty and youth, endowed with strong passions and high aspirations, our heroine commences a new life. Changing her name to Magdalen Power, and concealing her antecedents, she assumes the position of governess in a squatter's family in the bush. Her pupils are three girls, Hyacinth, Lily and Violet, the eldest of whom, "Hyacinth, darkly embowered in the riches of clustering curls," is just entering on womanhood. The father is a widower. All goes on smoothly and pleasantly for some time, our heroine winning golden opinions from all around her. She loves and is beloved by her pupils. But alas! fate, in the person of Raymond Trevelyan, steps in and mars the pastoral happiness of the scene. Raymond is the son of a convict, and though not specifically described by the poet, evidently possesses all the attributes of youth and manly beauty which a hero should possess. Hyacinth loves him, and her passion is reciprocated by him, while he bestows on the governess no more attention than satisfies the demands of politeness. Magdalen, however, finds in Raymond all her dreams realised.

"Dream, heart, no more of thy lyre-lauded heroes and demi-gods storied!
Open thine eyes on the breathing fulfilment of beauty and strength!
Down in the vines he is sitting; I see him leaf-girt and leaf-gloried.
Prince of my dreams, by the throbs of this heart thou art come, come at length."

She determines to win him at all hazards. Her former love for Hyacinth is changed into jealousy and contempt. She argues that Hyacinth is too young and shallow to satisfy a man like Raymond Trevelyan.

"She is a child; I a woman; and he! could he fill up the measure
Of the great longing I read in his eyes with a kiss or a song?
Greatness of heart soon outgrows the mild dainties of infantile pleasure;
Weak, silly-winning young ways are poor wiles for the wise and the strong.

"It is not ivy he needeth, the boughs of his manhood caressing,
Ivy that drains what it clings to and stoppeth the life of the tree.
It is the earth for the roots, and the blood of the storm, and the blessing
Wrapt in the rolling of vapours, and born of the sun and the sea.

"These would I give him, a closer embrace than poor parasite clinging,
Being his meat, and his drink, and his strength, and his light, and his breath,
Is not this better than daintiest love-lore of sighing and singing?
Hyacinth! Hyacinth! It is not you! it is I, . . his till death."

She further argues that Hyacinth has the world to choose from; that she herself has the better claim to Raymond "because of the taint he inherits," that in her position as guardian of Hyacinth, it is her duty to watch over her, and see that she makes no *mésalliance*. Having by these sophistical reasonings brought her conscience and her inclinations into accord, she schemes to separate the lovers. Hyacinth, through Magdalen's advice, is sent to school in the city; Magdalen, who has promised to act as go-between, keeps her letters from Raymond, at the same time practising all her blandishments on him to steal his heart away from Hyacinth. Success crowns her efforts. Raymond believing Hyacinth faithless and fickle, transfers his affection to Magdalen, whose love for him has increased in proportion to the guilt she has incurred in gaining him. But though she has her wish, remorse destroys all happiness. The voice of conscience, though stilled, is not silenced, and embitters her joy. She exclaims against fate, rails against nature, and finally tries to banish her self-reproaches in the arms of her lover.

"I am a fool to indulge me in sadness of spirit communing.
Thought is all sadness; but night is all kindness: the stars are on high.
It is the hour. I will rush to him, cling to him, revel to swooning
In the dear love of him. Eat, drink, be merry, to-morrow we die."

Driven almost mad by her self-tormentings, Magdalen is taken ill with a fever, and in her delirious ravings reveals the whole story to Hyacinth's father. The old man, enraged at finding his daughter in love with a convict's son, sends for her, and having led her to her mother's grave, he holds up the wedding ring of his former wife, and registers the following vow:—

"When I shall offer this ring as a sacred and covenant token
Unto a convict, the choice of thy father: then love where thou wilt.
Can I more fitly say never? Enough. When my purpose is broken
Go thou to Raymond, and make thyself kin to dishonour and guilt."

The reader will now easily foresee the *dénoûement*. Hyacinth's father, desiring a mother for his children, and little guessing that Magdalen is herself a convict, proposes marriage to her in the following dignified but dispassionate words:—

"Beauteous I see thee; yet 'tis not thy beauty that tempts me to sue thee;
'Tis that I've noted thee faithful in many things, weighty and small.
Gifted I know thee; yet not thy attainments could tempt me to woo thee:
Nought I behold save *thou* lovest *them*, and *they thee*—this is all.

Magdalen's breast. It is in this powerful delineation of a mind at war with itself that Mr. Brunton Stephens excels all our other poets. It is this which gives him a high, perhaps the highest, place among Australian poets. We can scarcely conceive of a greater difference between two poems than that existing between "Convict Once," and "The Godolphin Arabian," Mr. Stephens's only other considerable poem. The latter poem is, however, in its way, quite as meritorious as the former. In it Mr. Stephens narrates the strange adventures and misadventures of the Arabian horse, possessed by Lord Goldolphin during last century, which was one of the founders of the modern thoroughbred. Mr. Stephens has employed in this poem the ottava rima stanza, first introduced into English poetry by Frere, and subsequently used with such effect by Byron in Beppo and Don Juan. This stanza is peculiarly well fitted for a serio-comic poem, affording ample scope for all the eccentricities of rhyming and punning. Scham, for that is the name of the hero of the story, was one of a number of Arab horses sent as a present by the Bey of Tunis to the King of France. Agba, who shares the honours of the story with Scham, is a black mute sent over in charge of the horses, who worships Scham with the devotion which only an Arab can show towards a horse. The Arab breed not being then appreciated or understood in Europe, Scham and his companions are doomed to the ignoble occupation of drawing victual waggons. Scham's behaviour in this position is thus described:—

"He'd seize the other horses by the mane,
  Tear out a bushel and a few odd pecks,
Then by the tail, and do the same again,
  Or bite a savory morsel from their necks;
Then of a sudden he would go insane
  Over some crittur of the other sex:
For—would you credit it?—among the mares,
That duffer gave himself no end of airs."

In fact his conduct was generally so outrageous, that he was sold out of the king's service to a carter, who worked him hard and ill-treated him. From this evil plight Scham is rescued by a benevolent Quaker, who purchases him from his inhuman master and conveys him to England. Throughout all his wanderings, and fortunes, Scham is attended by Agba, and by a cat, which has struck up a close friendship with the horse. This extraordinary trio naturally pass through many strange adventures in England, their misfortunes generally being brought upon them by Scham's misconduct. That noble animal certainly is spoiled by prosperity, and astonishes his successive owners by kicking the grooms, smashing the stable, damaging the other horses, and generally making himself a nuisance and a terror to every one around him. No one except Agba, who, being dumb, is unable to explain matters, ever suspects the value of Scham, or knows that

"This horse, degraded and despised,
  Could boast itself of blood and noble race—
The race in Barbary most highly prized,
  Which far into antiquity could trace
From sire to sire a lineage idolized
  For union rare of swiftness, strength, and grace."

And even if it had been known, the fact might not have raised Scham in the opinion of his masters, such was the gross ignorance then existing in England in the matter of horseflesh. Scham at last comes into the possession of Lord Godolphin, the great sporting nobleman. Neither that nobleman, nor Chifney, his master of the stud, is aware of the treasure they have acquired, until Scham asserts himself in a manner there is no mistaking. The crack horse in Lord Godolphin's stud is Hobgoblin, a handsome grey, and the only thing which rankles in Agba's mind is the fact that Hobgoblin holds that "pride of place" in the stud which he considers the peerless Scham should occupy. However, Scham, Agba, and the cat are well treated at Gog-Magog, Lord Godolphin's place, and events flow on evenly and peacefully from day to day.

"And so they lived, so might have died content,
  The Barb, the cat, and last, not least, the Moor;
In all the odour (it's a frousy scent)
  Of sanctity, lamented though obscure,
But for the one significant event
  That makes or mars the life of rich and poor,
And which did each in turn to all the three;
Now for the usual question, 'Who was she?'"

The "she" in this case was Roxana, a mare—

"Twice victrix at Newmarket her renown,
  Had fired Godolphin, liver, heart, and brain,
Hobgoblin's strength, her swiftness thus would crown
  Whatever horse affiance could attain;
And so the double virtue handed down
  Converge supremely from the matchless twain:
This Sultan great must have a great Sultana,
He bought her for him, the far-famed Roxana."

But Agba takes a desperate resolve, and, just as the espousals of Hobgoblin and Roxana are about to be celebrated, he lets the great *Scham* loose upon the scene. We regret that we cannot quote in full the description of the fight which ensues between Hobgoblin and Scham. It is quite Homeric, only more interesting than most of Homer's battles. Hobgoblin fights gallantly, but is no match for the Barb—

"From time to time a cry of anguish rose,
  From time to time a shrill triumphant blast;
Then with redoubled fury they would close,
  And once more hold each other hard and fast,
Till the grey steed for reasons adipose
  Gave panting signs of giving in at last.
Ah! had that champion's wind but matched his pluck,
His veteran flag he never would have struck!

"Yet still he fought, with many a labouring wheeze,
  And while he had his stock of breath fought well.
Twice on his haunches, lastly on his knees,
  Beneath the onslaught of his foe he fell.
Thenceforth his conduct wasn't quite the cheese,
  He rose and fled with agonising yell
Right through a gate which Agba opened then,
And which he just as quickly closed again.

"And Scham, great Scham, too noble to pursue,
  Proud, radiant, triumphant, raised his head,
Shook out his bloody mane and dripping queue,
  And crowed a neigh, enough to wake the dead.
Whereat, a little note that thrilled him through,
  The sweetest that e'er came from quadruped,
Responded in a plaintive minor key,
It was Roxana—prize of victory!"

The result of this is, that Scham, Agba, and the cat are packed off in sad disgrace to a dreary common where they drag on a miserable existence; meantime—

"Poor Madamoiselle Roxana, now Madame,
  Obscurely brought to light the son of Scham."

This foal of Roxana's is the celebrated Lath, who subsequently beats all two-year-olds at Newmarket, to Godolphin's unutterable delight. Scham's pre-eminence being thus proved, he is brought back to Gog-Magog, where he meets with quite an ovation. He is of course accompanied by Agba and the cat, who share his prosperity as they have shared his misfortunes. Hobgoblin is ignominiously turned out to grass, and Scham installed in his place as head of the stud. Scham lives to an honoured old age, "begets sons and daughters," and finally dies in the odour of sanctity.

"But though so long ago Scham's race was run,
And though Gog-Magog holds his honoured clay,
While sweeps are made, while maiden plates are won;
While 'fortunes hang upon the Derby day,'
While handicaps endure beneath the sun,
While odds are given on chesnut, brown, or bay,
Long after time is done with you and me—
His single name shall make a pedigree.

"And poor Roxana! did she share his lot?
And did he end with her as he began?
I very much regret it—he did *not*.
I cannot hide the fact, do all I can;
Yet think it not so very foul a blot—
Remember Scham was a Mohammedan;
Besides his heart was vast and many-sided,
And could enclose whate'er the gods provided."

The whole poem is most gracefully and wittily written. It might fitly be termed the epic of horseflesh. There is not a dull page in the poem from beginning to end, and the reader rises from its perusal feeling better, and happier, and altogether more kindly disposed towards the whole dumb portion of creation. Mr. Stephens has recently published a small volume entitled "The Black Gin." It contains poems chiefly on Australian subjects, both humorous and serious, the former predominating. As an example of Mr. Stephens's slighter productions, we shall give a few stanzas from the address "To a Black Gin":—

"Daughter of Eve draw near, I would behold thee,
Good life! could ever arm of man enfold thee,
Did the same nature that made Phryne, mould thee?

Thy dress is somewhat scant for proper feeling,
As is thy flesh too—scarce thy bones concealing,
Thy calves unquestionably want *revealing*.

Thy mangy skin is hideous with tattooing,
And legible with hieroglyphic wooing.
Sweet things in art of some fierce lover's doing.

For thou some lover hast, I'll bet a guinea,
Some partner in thy fetid ignominy,
The *raison d'être* of this piccaninny.

What must *he* be whose eye thou hast delighted,
His sense of beauty hopelessly benighted,
The canons of his taste how badly sighted."

In a similar strain of grim humour to this are "The Piccaninny," and "New Chum and Old Monarch." There is one powerful poem in the volume, entitled "A Lost Chance," founded on a story of a shepherd who, having grazed his flocks in Queensland for years on land where rich tin mines were subsequently discovered, goes mad with disappointment on learning the chance which he has missed. On the whole, the volume keeps up Mr. Stephens's well-earned reputation. We trust, however, that he will not fritter away his talents on mere occasional poems, but will devote himself to some considerable poem on an Australian subject.

The next poet who claims our attention is a Victorian—Mr. George Gordon M'Crae. He is the author of two aboriginal romances, "Mamba" and "Balladeadro," and a dramatic study, entitled, "The Man in the Iron Mask." In "Mamba" and "Balladeadro" Mr. M'Crae has tried to do for our aboriginals what Longfellow attempted with the North American Indians in "Hiawatha." It is no discredit to Mr. M'Crae to have failed where the elder poet had failed before him. It seems impossible to invest savage man with sufficient interest to carry him successfully through a long poem as hero. Mr. M'Crae's materials were certainly more unpromising than those which Longfellow had to work upon. The aboriginal of this country, at his best, is but a sorry specimen of humanity, and vastly inferior to the "noble savage" of America. We think Mr. Brunton Stephens's method of treating him—from a purely humorous standpoint—is more successful than Mr. M'Crae's attempt to make a hero of him. Mr. M'Crae has very fortunately avoided one serious fault which Longfellow fell into, viz., tediousness. The brevity of "Balladeadro" and "Mamba" prevent any reader from wearying during the perusal of them; and though they cannot be said to be either very remarkable, or original poems, theyare pleasing and graceful in portions, and as a whole sufficiently interesting to carry the reader to the close without much effort on his part. As the two poems are very similar in style and subject, and as "Mamba" is the later, and, we think, the better of them, we shall take it as sufficiently representing Mr. M'Crae's efforts in this line of poetry. The plot is characterised by simplicity. Mamba, who loses his mother immediately after his own birth, is brought up by his foster-mother, Borote, who watches over his infancy with more than a mother's love, and sees him grow up to manhood, with pride, not unmixed with apprehension at the boy's bold and adventurous spirit. Nernepten, one of the greatest warriors of the tribe, trains Mamba up in all feats of arms, teaches him the mysteries of hunting and fishing, and how to shape the spear, the boomerang, and the malka. The time approaches when Mamba must, in accordance with the customs of his tribe, pass through the fearful rite of the "ghimbo-boke," or "man-making," which every youth, who aspires to become a warrior, must undergo. What the ceremonies attendant on this mysterious and terrible rite are, the poet does not inform us. Probably they are too direful to be revealed to the uninitiated. Let it suffice, that Mamba passes successfully through them, and takes his place among the "braves" of his tribe. The following is the poet's description of the "yapeen," or "corroboree," which follows the "man-making":—

"The day had fled, the moon arose,
Night straight began with evening's close,
A night whose calm and silvery sheen
Befitted well the wild yapeen.
Within the circle of the camp
Blazed the clear fire, while measured tramp
Of dancing warriors shook the ground
To song and time sticks' throbbing sound.

"There twice two hundred feet advanced,
There twice a hundred malkas glanced
Bright in the moon, that silvered o'er
The arms that all those malkas bore.
Wild the device and strange the sign
That stared in many a snowy line
From beaming face and heaving breast,
And limbs that seldom paused to rest,
Whilst all the rib-like lines laid on
Made each man seem a skeleton.
Nodded the feathers from the red
And netted band that bound each head,

"And hoarsely rustling leaves of trees
Shook round dark ankles in the breeze;
The singers with their time stick rang
The cadence of the song they sang;
And every face and limb below,
And tree above them caught the glow
That spread from camp fire's rising blaze,
Lighting the yapeen's wondrous maze
Of feet and ankles in the dance
With fitful gleam or twinkling glance."

Mamba, like Nimrod, proves himself a mighty hunter, and while out on one of his expeditions is decoyed into an ambush and slain by the warriors of a rival tribe, Borote's gloomy anticipations being thus fulfilled. Nernepten, impelled thereto by Borote, goes forth, determined to find Mamba's body, and revenge his death. After three days and nights' search he discovers the body of the murdered man. Nernepten, in accordance with native custom, draws a trench round the corpse and watches the direction which the first insect that issues from the trench, takes. This is the omen which a native "revenger of blood" accepts to guide him to the murderers.

" He paced the body round and round
Three times—when, issuing from the ground,
Behold a beetle's shining mail,
The beetle crawling to the vale
That lay below the mountain pass,
Above the wild, the wide morass ;
Eastward, still eastward on he fled
To show the band with murder red."

Nernepten follows the beetle, and, of course, is conducted to the murderers. Though with the fearful odds of four to one against him, the doughty old warrior fights, and wins the day. Mamba is avenged, Nernepten returns to the camp, and is rewarded with Borote's hand and heart.

" Happy, happy, happy pair,
None but the brave deserve the fair !"

Throughout both this poem and " Balladeadro," Mr. M'Crae has, it is evident, derived large draughts of inspiration from Walter Scott's narrative poems. The metre and versification, as well as the style of description, remind us very strongly of " Marmion " and the " Lady of the Lake." The great fault in the descriptive parts is a tendency to diffuseness. Occasional marks of carelessness, apparent in both poems, would lead to the conclusion that they had been written rather hurriedly. The poet deserves great credit for the pains he has evidently taken, to master the manners and customs of the aboriginal inhabitants of this continent. The introductory verses of " Mamba " are perhaps as pretty as any lines in the poem.

" A story of the mount and plain,
  The lake, the river, and the sea ;
A voice that wakes to life again
  An age long slumbering melody ;
A dream of winds and rustling trees,
  Of whispering reeds, of sighing sedge ;
Of woods that woo the fickle breeze,
  Or wave the grass from topmost ledge ;

" Of foreland stretching o'er the deep,
Where crowned with snowy sparkling foam
The blue wave thunders 'gainst the steep,
And stars with spray the purple dome.

" A memory in a narrow span
Of days long dead—too bright to last ;
A shadow of primeval man,
A foot-fall echo of the past."

On the whole, both these poems are gratifying, rather from the promise they hold forth of future excellence, than for their own mere intrinsic merits. " The Man in the Iron Mask " is a far higher poetic effort than either "Mamba" or "Balladeadro." Mr. M'Crae exhibits in it an improvement in every essential particular on his earlier poems. His descriptive passages are no longer diffuse and merely pretty. He paints with a stronger and firmer hand. His poetic expression has gained in conciseness, and there is altogether more real thought and reflection displayed by the poet than was apparent in his earlier efforts. The blank verse is throughout sonorous and musical, and some of the lyrics scattered through the poem are very beautiful. The faults in the poem are those almost inherent in the subject. There is scarcely any action. A poem which merely depicts the meditations and reflections of a prisoner for life, whose only excitement consists in his removal from one gaol to another, is apt to become monotonous. Mr. M'Crae is evidently aware of this defect, and has striven to obviate it by introducing a good many episodes and lyrics into the poem, and some of these are among the best passages in it. Take the following, entitled " Morning at Sea in the Tropics ":—

" Night waned and wasted, and the fading stars
Died out like lamps that long survived a feast,
And the moon, pale with watching, sank to rest
Behind the cloud-piled ramparts of the main.
Young, blooming morn, crowned with her bridal wreath,
Bent o'er her mirror clear the faithful sea,
And gazing on her loveliness therein,
Blushed to the brows, till every imaged charm
Flung roses on the bosom of the wave.
Then, glancing heavenward, both, they blushed again,
As sprang the sun to claim his radiant bride,
And sea and sky seemed but one rose of morn,
Which thenceforth grew in glory, and the world
Shot back her lesser light upon the day,

While night sped on to seek the sombre shades
That sleep in silent caves beyond the sea.

* * * *

Meanwhile our ship sped on with breathing sails,
Fraught with the melody of murmuring song,
Such as the zephyr chanted to the morn,
And showers of diamonds flashed before the prow,
While sternwards whirled unstrung pale beads of foam—
Pearls from the loosen'd chaplet of the sea.
'Mid these the flame-bright nautilus, that seemed
Itself a flow'ret cast upon the stream,
Spread out its crimson sail and drifted on.
Beyond arose a cloud (as 'twere) of birds
That leapt from out the wave to meet the sun,
Flew a short circuit till their wings grew dry,
And seaward fell in showers of silver rain.
'Mid these careered the dolphin-squadrons swift,
With mail of changeful hue, and Iris tints;
And floating slowly on a sea-flower passed,
A living creature, none the less a flower,
That lives its life in joy, and dies for joy,
Unmissed 'mid myriads in the sapphire sea."

This is a very gorgeous and magnificent description. Indeed the whole poem abounds in beautiful passages. Among the many hypotheses which have been suggested to account for the existence of that very mysterious person, "the Man in the Iron Mask," Mr. M'Crae has adopted the most romantic of all—that the prisoner was a twin brother of Louis Quatorze. But granting that this hypothesis is the one most suited for a poem, we hardly think that Mr. M'Crae has made the most of it. What a subject for mental analysis is afforded by a prisoner suffering under such a monstrous wrong! What a powerful picture Browning would have given us! Mr. M'Crae's prisoner is a very easy going person. He plays on the lute, sings, listens to tales from his old nurse, converses with his gaolers on ordinary topics, eats off silver dishes, and altogether manages to make life pass very pleasantly. We fancy that a person acquainted with his rights, and suffering under a sense of the most intolerable wrongs, would express himself in a very different style from that adopted by Mr. M'Crae's hero. The last extract we shall make from the poem, will be the passage where the poet speaks of his own art—poesy:—

"How many players o'er thee bent,
Since time began, or man was made;

Divine, o'er welling instrument,
  Whose tones breathe life—in light and shade—
Thou wakest at thy votary's touch,
  To speech, to laughter, or to song;
Sighing where joy or grief o'er much,
  Lay on the bosom late or long;
And every burning thought that thrills
  The pregnant brain, the answering heart,
Obedient to the Power that wills—
  Finds in thy song its counterpart."

Surely a poet with so lofty and exalted an idea of his vocation, is capable of giving us something vastly superior to anything he has yet written.

The last poet we shall deal with will also be a Victorian poet, A. Lindsay Gordon, whose melancholy and tragic end will doubtless still be fresh in the memory of our readers. If, as Milton says, any one who aspires to be a poet, must make his life a poem, Gordon at least could claim this qualification of a poet. No poem ever written could be more romantic or sadder than his life and death. He was a man possessed of high mental qualifications and an aspiring spirit. A great part of his life was passed in the bush, amid those scenes which he describes so vividly in some of his poems. Himself a bold and fearless rider, he describes incidents connected with hunting and racing in a manner which no mere book-worm could hope to rival. In "How we beat the favourite," the verse seems to sweep along with all the wild impetuosity of the headlong race which he is describing. This poem takes a high rank even among the best English poems of a similar class. "Britomarte," and "From the Wreck," are also vivid delineations of active life, of a very high order of merit. But Gordon did not excel merely in narrative poetry. In the "Sick Stockrider," after dealing as usual with his favourite subjects, bush life and incidents, he concludes with the following pathetic lines:—

"I've had my share of pastime, and I've done my share of toil,
  And life is short—the longest life a span.
I care not now to tarry for the corn, or for the oil,
  Or for the wine that maketh glad the heart of man;
For good undone, and gifts misspent, and resolution vain.
  'Tis somewhat late to trouble—this I know,
I should live the same life over if I had to live again,
  And the chances are I go where most men go.
The deep blue skies wax dusky and the tall green trees grow dim,
  The sward beneath me seems to heave and fall,

And sickly, smoky shadows through the sleepy sunlight swim,
And on the very sun's face weave their pall.
Let me slumber in the hollow where the wattle blossoms wave,
With never stone or rail to fence my bed;
Should the sturdy station children pull the bush-flowers on my grave,
I may chance to hear them romping overhead."

The idea contained in the last two lines is singularly beautiful and touching. Gordon, like all our poets, has been largely influenced by contemporary English poetry. Swinburne and Browning seem to have affected his style most. "The Three Friends" is a very powerful poem, much in the manner of the latter poet, while in the dedication to "Bush Ballads," a very beautiful piece of writing, he has copied closely the versification and phraseology of Swinburne. The poem will certainly compare very favorably with anything that poet ever wrote. The following are the opening stanzas:—

"They are rhymes rudely strung with intent less
Of sound than of words,
In lands where bright blossoms are scentless,
And songless bright birds;
Where, with fire and fierce drought on her tresses,
Insatiable summer oppresses
Sere woodlands and sad wildernesses,
And faint flocks and herds.

"Where in dreariest days, when all dews end,
And all winds are warm,
Wild winter's large floodgates are loosen'd,
And floods freed from storm;
From broken-up fountain heads, dash on
Dry deserts with long pent up passion—
Here rhyme was first framed without fashion,
Song shaped without form.

"Whence gathered? The locusts' glad chirrup
May furnish a stave,
The ring of a rowel and stirrup,
The wash of a wave.
The chaunt of the marsh frog in rushes,
That chimes through the pauses and hushes
Of nightfall, the torrent that gushes,
The tempests that rave."

Of "Ashtaroth" we cannot speak very favorably. It is a mysterious production, apparently inspired by a careful study of "Faust" and "Manfred." There is a Norman baron named Hugo, who is influenced by love, partly for learning, but more strongly for women. The gentleman in black is also present, under the name of Orion. Of course a Corsair and an outlawed count are introduced. Hugo has sold himself to the devil, but, as is usual in such cases, comes out all right in the end. There are the customary paraphernalia to be found in such poems—a convent, a castle, monks, spirits, robbers, &c. To make the resemblance to "Faust" still greater, a kind of "Walpurgis Night" is introduced. Hugo and Orion enter riding, on "black horses," at midnight, in a "mountainous country overlooking a rocky pass." Under these trying circumstances, no wonder Hugo sees strange sights and hears spirits chanting unhallowed songs. The whole poem is a mistake, and is very crudely written. Such lines as the following are quite inexcusable :—

"ERIC. Now, I wonder where he is gone !
HUGO. Indeed I had not the slightest idea,
The man is certainly mad ;
He wedded my sister Dorothea,
And used her cruelly bad."

Even Lord Macaulay's proverbial schoolboy would have been whipped if he had perpetrated such trash as this. There are, however, several fine lyrics scattered through the poem, which atone somewhat for its general barrenness. In order that, in parting with Gordon, we may show him at his best, we shall quote Thora's song:

"We severed in Autumn early,
Ere the earth was torn by the plough ;
The wheat and the oats and the barley,
Are ripe for the harvest now.
We sundered one misty morning,
Ere the hills were dimmed with the rain,
Through the flowers those hills adorning,
Thou comest not back again.

"My heart is heavy and weary
With the weight of a weary soul ;
The mid-day glare groweth dreary,
And dreary the mid-night scroll ;
The corn-stalks sigh for the sickle
'Neath the load of their golden grain ;
I sigh for a mate more fickle,
Thou comest not back again.

"The warm sun riseth and setteth,
The night bringeth moistening dew ;
But the soul that longeth, forgetteth
The warmth and the moisture too ;

"In the hot sun rising and setting,
There is nought save feverish pain;
There are tears in the night dew wetting,
Thou comest not back again.

"Thy voice in my ear still mingles
With the voice of whispering trees,
Thy kiss on my cheek still tingles
At its kiss of the summer breeze;
While dreams of the past are thronging
For substance of shades in vain,
I'm waiting, watching, and longing,
Thou comest not back again.

"Waiting and watching ever,
Longing and lingering yet,
Leaves rustle and cornstalks quiver,
Winds murmur and waters fret;
No answer they bring, no greeting,
No speech save that sad refrain,
No voice, save an echo repeating,
'He cometh not back again.'"

We regret that the length to which this article has already extended, precludes us from doing more than merely allude to Mr. Finnamore's two careful and scholarly tragedies—"Francesca Vasari" and "Carpio." Perhaps at some future time we may be able to do justice to them. Of the numerous other poets hailing from the different colonies, we have no space to say anything. We have spoken of Messrs. Kendall, Brunton Stephens, M'Crae, and Gordon, because we consider them the representative men among our poets.

In concluding these desultory remarks on Australian poetry, it may perhaps be as well to sum up briefly what appear to us to be its general characteristics. Our poets, as a rule, are masters of the art of metre and rhythm. Their powers of description are also more than ordinary, and their command of language is extensive. These, however, are rather the externals of poetry than the vital parts. He who seeks to move his fellow men must display a knowledge of human nature, and more especially of the highest kinds of human nature. If he does not do this, he must, at any rate, by a judicious use of plot and incident, endeavour to add an interest to characters otherwise uninteresting. To place a mere everyday character in everyday circumstances will excite but little interest, but to place an Othello or Macbeth under the most urgent pressure of jealousy, or ambition, is the highest effort of the greatest poet. In the neglect of this rule lies the great mistake made by most of our poets. They have not studied human nature sufficiently, neither have they compensated for this defect by betraying any great aptitude for plot or incident. A cognate error is, that they do not deal in any degree with the ordinary philosophical questions of the day. Without being admirers of purely didactic, or metaphysical poetry, we think our poets might, in this matter, have taken a lesson from the two greatest of living poets, as they have done in many less important points. Tennyson and Browning deal not only with human nature, but with human nature represented as grappling with the serious mental questions, which must suggest themselves to every thinking person at the present day. Another very serious defect in even the best of our poets, is their incapacity for a sustained effort. They can write good lyrics, but their longer poems are too often a mere string of fine passages, with little coherence or congruity. When they begin to do their best they begin to fall away. It should be remembered that the production of a few fine passages, or even of a single short poem of considerable excellence, does not constitute a man a great poet. He only is a great poet who produces a great work. There must be quantity as well as quality. Gray's elegy may, in its way, be quite as perfect as Paradise Lost, but Gray is not therefore as great a poet as Milton. But perhaps the most fatal of all the defects of our colonial poets is their tendency to imitate prior and contemporary English poets. This we conceive to be a most serious mistake. Imitation of nature is doubtless the foundation of all poetry, but imitation of nature as already imitated by other poets, will, we submit, in all probability produce but a distorted image of the original. When we speak of "*Australian* poetry," we do not mean merely poetry written by men who happen to have been born in Australia, or to have lived part of their lives there. We mean by "Australian poetry" poetry which smacks of the soil, which deals with Australian scenery, Australian modes of life, and Australian methods of thought. Could a painter who had passed all his days in England or Scotland give us the deep dreamy Australian sky of Guerard or Buvelot? Why then should a writer who perhaps has never seen any other country besides Australia, save through "the spectacles of books," enter into an unfair and unequal competition with poets, who describe what they have seen with their own eyes? Wordsworth is at his best when he describes the mountains and lakes of his own Cumberland. Byron and Shelley would never have described Italy and the East with accuracy, had they not travelled through, or lived in, the parts which they describe. If anyone will take the pains to compare the descriptions of the East, given by Byron, with those of Moore in "Lalla Rookh," he will at once perceive the difference between poetry inspired by an actual contemplation of nature herself, and that produced by mere reading. Yet Moore took the utmost pains to qualify himself for his task, by studying books on the East. But it may be said that man is the same in all countries and climates—that human passions and feelings are the same, under all conditions of life. We cannot accede to this. We think the mind of man is little less affected by his natural surroundings, than his body is. Walter Savage Landor states this view plainly, when he says:—

> "We are what suns and winds and waters make us,
> The mountains are our sponsors, and the rills,
> Fashion and win their nursling, with their smiles."

He further goes on to affirm that

> "The heart is hardest in the softest climes;
> The passions flourish, the affections die."

Whether this latter statement is correct or not we do not venture to affirm; but of the truth of the general proposition he is enforcing—namely, that the heart and mind of man are affected by the variations of country and climate—we are firmly convinced. Wordsworth throughout all his poems is constantly dwelling on the same idea. There may be no great difference at present between an Englishman and an Australian, but there is some difference, and that difference will increase from generation to generation. If this be so, our poets will have to deal with the phases of human nature which they themselves come in contact with. Convict life, the diggings, bush life, all afford fresh and striking materials for a poet's pen. What can be made of colonial subjects, when in competent hands, has been proved by Messrs. Kendall and Gordon, when they have availed themselves of such subjects. Bret Harte, and Joaquin Miller, have almost invented a new kind of poetry, by the fresh and original manner in which they have dealt with American life and character. These poets, with Lowell, we consider much more entitled to be considered the *national* poets of America than Bryant and Longfellow, who have little in their poetry to distinguish them from English poets. Let our poets then take heart of grace. Let them desist from this ceaseless imitation of the latest fashions in English poetry. Let them study, not nature less, but human nature more; and above all, let them deal more with Australian subjects. The constant repetition of the old classical and romantic stories is getting wearisome, and is as senseless in our poets, as it would be for them to reproduce the frigid love-making of Waller and Prior; and babble about Sacharissa's shoe-tie, or Chloe's fan. There need be no dearth of materials for our poets if they will only stretch forth their hands and grasp the wealth which lies around them. When they do this, when they have the courage to be original and discard conventionality, which has always been the bane of poetry, then, and then only, shall we possess a true Australian poetry. Till then we shall have a poetry which is Australian only in name, and which is nothing more than second or third rate English poetry. Some of our poets have pointed out the true path. It is to be regretted that they have not walked more in it themselves. Let us hope, however, that our future poets, while partaking of the ability of their predecessors, may be warned by their failures and avoid their errors. If this article has any influence in bringing about such a result, its object will be more than accomplished.

S. S. T.

TRANSLATION OF A PORTION OF THE MILES GLORIOSUS, OR THE BRAGGART CAPTAIN (PLAUTUS).

The characters in the New Comedy, from which school of dramatic literature all Plautus' plays are taken, represent types of domestic life such as might have been met with any day at Athens. The same characters occur in almost every play, and there is a monotony about the plots which, to a modern playgoer, must seem painfully dull. The limited number of characters at the command of the Roman playwright seems due partly to the fact that the theatres were so enormous that the audience would fail to appreciate any situation depending on characters with which they were not perfectly familiar; partly to the striking lack of invention which characterised the Romans. The appended translations may serve to give the English reader some notion of the way in which Plautus depicts his braggart soldiers and parasites, the ancestors of the Captain Bobadills, the Roister Doisters, and the Falstaffs of modern times. They may also serve to instance the peculiar way in which Plautus introduces one of his characters as explaining the plot of the play before the action begins. Matthew Merrygreek, in Nicholas Udall's "Roister Doister" (the first English comedy), is quite the counterpart of Artotrogus in the lines:—

> "Sometimes I hang on Hankyn Hoddydoddy's sleeve;
> But this day on Ralph Roister Doister's, by his leave;
> For, truly, of all men he is my chief banker,
> Both for meat and money, and my chief sheet anchor.
> But now of Roister Doister somewhat to express,
> That ye may esteem him after his worthiness;
> In these twenty towns, and seek them throughout,
> Is not the like stock whereon to graft a lout.
> All the day long is he facing and craking
> Of his great acts in fighting and fray making:
> But when Roister Doister is put to the proof,
> To keep the Queen's peace is more for his behoof."

Act I. Scene 1.

PYRGOPOLINICES—ARTOTROGUS.

PY.—See that my shield be polished bright, I pray,
Brighter than sunshine on a cloudless day;
That when the *mêlée* comes, its glitt'ring blaze
May scare the foeman and confuse his gaze—
For I would free my worthy sword from care
And save it from its mood of blunt despair.

To mincemeat small it fain would hack my foes,
And yet must hang in indolent repose.
But where's Artotrogus? Ar.—He's here, he's here!
The henchman of a hero void of fear;
A hero bold and fair, and bred to wars;
A warrior to the backbone. Mighty Mars
Would stand dumbfoundered, utter not a word,
Nor dare to match his deeds with yours, my lord.
Py.—Mars! Ha! the fellow whom I saved from death
Upon the gory field of — Tavern Heath?
Was brave Bombastes, Neptune's son and heir,
The captain-general of the forces there?
Ar.—The very same: the knight in gold arrayed;
You breathed;—and all his legions, presto! fade,—
Like leaves before the wind, or roofing thatch—
Py.—That's nothing. Ar.—No, I think that I can match
All that you say (*aside*) with what you've never done!
If there's a man on earth who's heard of one
Whose lies were greater, or whose talk as brave
As this my friend's:—I'd gladly be his slave!
He has a cheesecake, though, of dainty flavour,
A bite of which I'd deem a wondrous favour.
Py.—Where are you? Ar.—Here, sir—but I can't resist
Calling to mind the day when with your fist
Upon the trunk an elephant you hit
And smashed it. 'Twas in India, eh? Py.—That's it!
But not the trunk? Ar.—I mean, of course, the thigh.
Py.—I can do more whene'er I choose to try.
Ar.—Of course, if you had tried the very least
You would have crushed the life out of the beast.
You could have passed your fist, you needs must own,
Right through the monster, piercing skin and bone!
Py.—Come, nonsense! Ar.—Well, '*tis* nonsense, thus to tell
Your valorous deeds to me who know them well.
(Aside) My hunger listens till mine ears are dull.
O would my seat of appetite were full.
But no. I e'en must drain his twaddle dry,
And vouch the truth of all that he shall lie.
Men have to do things which they don't much like,
For fear their teeth should have to go on strike.

Py.—What was I saying? Ar.—Ha! I have it now!
I know it! I remember it, I vow!
Py.—Remember what? Ar.—Whatever 'twas you meant—
Py.—Come, paper, quick! Ar.—Enlist a regiment,[*]
Is that your purpose? Here's a stylus too.
Py.—You do with tact just what I'd have you do—
Your will and mine are one. Ar.—It is my part
To teach myself to know your inmost heart,
And fly to catch whatever plan you start.
Py.—Do you remember now? Ar.—I do, I do!
A hundred men, Cilicians, you slew,
And then a hundred more, and fifty yet
Burglars or buglers—trifles I forget,
Then thirty Sardi in one day and more,
And Macedonian heroes full three score—
Py.—And what's the total? Ar.—Seven thousand just.
Py.—It makes that number: yes, I thought it must.
Ar.—I've none of them on paper, yet I find
I carry them exactly in my mind.
Py.—Your memory is good. Ar.—My memory's fed! (*aside*).
Py.—Keep it as good, and you shall ne'er lack bread.
Ar.—You can't forget on Cappadocia's plain
That glorious exploit of five hundred slain.
Had not your honour's sword been blunt, I know
They'd all have perished at one single blow.
Py.—Had they survived, they would have been not more
Than relics of the host I slew before.
Ar.—About your form and stature all men rave,
Call none but Pyrgopolinices brave.
The cynosure you are of woman's eyes:
I own I view the fact without surprise.
You are so handsome really, witness they,
The girls who button-holed me yesterday—
Py.—What said they to you? Ar.—Said? why, said they spied
A real Achilles walking by my side;
Asked if 'twas he. "His brother," I replied.
Chimes in another, "Gods! a hero fair!
"Why, what a presence and what lovely hair!

---

[*] "Rogare" was the technical term for enlisting men. They were asked to take the military oath, whence comes the form.

"I deem of all our sex most fortunate,
"Those women who with such a hero mate."
Py.—She really did so? Ar,—Yes, and what is more,
Both ladies begged I'd bring you past their door,
As if you were a pageant! Py.—What a bore
To be so handsome! Ar.—That you well may say—
They worry me to death, they beg and pray
That they may get a sight of you; they ask
I'd be so kind as fetch you—pretty task!
You've not a single moment of repose—
Py.—Now to the forum straightway, I propose
To inspect the burglars whom I yesterday
Enrolled, and give an earnest of their pay.

Act II. Scene 1.

PALAESTRIO.

The argument I'll tell you of this play.
Only, kind hearers, listen well, I pray.
If any says he will not, I reply
I'd sooner have his room, than company.
I'll tell the plot now, if you'll grant me grace,
Since you're assembled in this festive place,
In Greek 'Αλάζων is our play yclept:
We've changed the title, but the meaning kept.
This town is Ephesus: my master he
Who to the forum went: a debauchee,
A braggart shameless scoundrel, full of lies,
The magnet as he says of ladies' eyes.
He always cuts a figure most absurd.
An awkward churl as lover, on my word.
To woo his favours when the lasses try
Their very lips cannot but pout awry.
The reason if you please I'd have you know;
I left the lord I served some time ago.
Attend with all your ears and hear the plot.
To serve a lord at Athens was my lot.
He loved a gallant lady: she returned
His love, and no less passionately burned.
That is the best affection I maintain
When a fond lover finds he is loved again.

From Athens to Naupactus he was sent
On some great mission from the Government.
Meantime yon braggart captain hither came
And sneaked into the love of yonder dame;
The mother's goodwill first he gained by wine
And jewelry and gifts of dainties fine.
That intimacy gained (he was not nice),
He tricked that mother by some sharp device;
And shipped her daughter off against her will
To Ephesus (and here he holds her still).
So when I hear my lady's torn away
I get a ship myself without delay,
Meaning to sail unto Naupactus straight
To tell my lord before it was too late.
Soon as the land is almost out of view
We're chased and captured by a pirate crew.
And so was I undone ere I could tell
The message to my lord I loved so well.
The man who caught me, gave me as a prize
To this brave captain. Judge of my surprise
On entering the captain's house to see
My late lord's mistress! She then seeing me
Winked that her name aloud I should not call,
But when she got a chance she told me all;—
How sad her lot, how comfort was in vain
Until she saw dear Athens once again—
She said she loved the lord she'd left behind,
Hated the soldier more than all mankind.
When this I heard and knew my lady's bent
I took a tablet, sealed it up, and sent
The missive by a trader whom I prayed
To give it my old master: he obeyed—
My master heard and came without delaying:
Now with his father's pleasant friend he's staying,
An honest soul: this worthy gentleman
Gives us advice and aids us to a plan
To make the lovers meet.—I'll tell it you!
The captain keeps his mistress out of view
Shut in a private chamber, whither none
Has right of entrance but herself alone—

The houses stand together, and between
The two I've planned that she can pass unseen.
I've made an opening with my old friend's leave,
In fact, he made me first the plan conceive.
My fellow slave is but a witless fool;
I'll hoodwink him and use him as a tool;
By clever cunning and a quaint device
I'll cast so thick a film athwart his eyes
I'll make him see what he ne'er saw in fact,
The damsel here two characters shall act—
She's only one, you know, but shall appear
To be two girls in turn; I hope that's clear.
Aye! that will gull the keeper: Hark! the door!
'Tis the old man of whom I spoke before.

H. A. STRONG.

GOSSIP RESPECTING CURRENT SCIENCE.

ONE of the most valuable contributions yet made to colonial geology is undoubtedly the map of the entire Australian continent (the positions in which the various rock formations severally crop out being marked thereon) recently issued by the Mining Department. There are two ways in which geological surveys can be conducted. One seeks to accumulate a vast amount of facts collected in small areas at a time, the survey being exhaustive over one district before another is taken up. The other sketches somewhat roughly the various physical and rocky features of a whole country, island, or continent, leaving the details to be worked out at a future time. Mr. Selwyn seemed to be rather inordinately wedded to the first method, although his excellent map of the whole of Victoria showed that he was no slavish follower of the first plan, but that he, as occasion required, was quite willing to supplement it with the second. The present Secretary of Mines has gone a step further, and included all parts of explored Australia upon a sheet similar to that which his predecessor prepared of our own colony. It will be well, however, to bear in mind that the whole should be regarded as a sketch rather than a finished production. Even in the settled districts the greater part of the strata has never been scientifically explored, and new and valuable facts may be collected over the whole of them, by those persons who are willing to make the search.

The map before us is especially valuable, inasmuch as it sets before us at a glance some very curious features of the past and ancient history of the continent. A single glance will be adequate to discover how vast an area is occupied by what are termed the tertiary or newer deposits. These areas, dry land at present of course, represent bottoms of an ancient ocean subsequently upheaved. The existence of a new continuous continent as an archipelago of islands would, if modern theóries be correct, have no little influence in determining the distribution of animals, and the climate of the epoch. With such a configuration of the land, the Australia of the tertiary period must have presented, with respect to its vegetation, &c., a very different appearance from that now obtaining. The Eocene strata at Schnapper Point, as well as the travertin of Hobart Town, both indicate by their fossils that the climate of these localities must have been of a semi-tropical nature. The Rev. Julian Woods, too, in a paper read some time since before the Victorian Royal Society, put forth a theory based upon a careful observation of the more recent fossils, that a similar climate must have prevailed in Southern Australia at a period, geologically speaking, not at all remote. Nor is it by any means necessary, in order to account for these facts, to suppose that the sun at any previous time gave out a superabundance of heat. Climate in a great measure depends upon the distribution of land and water, and with our present dry land hidden for the most part beneath the ocean, and with, what is by no means improbable, the Indian Archipelago existing as a continent, the tropical nature of the marine fauna, and of the island vegetation then flourishing, is easily to be accounted for.

This condition, too, of Australia, as a group of islands, in a great measure throws a light upon the wonderful denudations and wearing away of the older strata. In New South Wales, for example, what are now termed the Blue Mountains was formerly a vast plateau of sandstone. It is now cut into ravines and gorges of the most romantic shape and fantastic appearance. The great puzzle, however, is that the valleys so formed have nearly all of them very narrow openings towards the sea. The force of the waves, therefore, as the wearing agent, is not admissible. Given the requisite amount of time, and rivers and streamlets would bring about the observed result, but the rivers which now flow through these valleys are of the most magnificent description. A vastly greater rainfall would, of course, in the course of ages achieve what the present pluvial forces are by no means adequate to perform, and it is only reasonable to suppose that with a greater amount of ocean around, and with the supposed Eastern Indian continent acting as an evaporating surface, that this far greater rainfall would be the natural result. At any rate, the district of the Blue Mountains referred to has every appearance of having remained as a long island above the surface of the sea through the countless centuries during which the entire series of Australian tertiary strata were being slowly deposited.

After the use of a good deal of harsh language and ridicule on both sides, it would appear that men of science are about to deal with the so called facts of spiritualism in a rational manner. They are, at any rate, admitting the *bona fide* nature of some of the phenomena, and are setting about an investigation of the why and the wherefore thereof in a way that cannot fail to clear up much that is mysterious, and expose many conclusions that are false. Mr. A. Wallace is well known as a believer in the reality of the spiritualistic theory. Messrs. Crookes and Huggins have both of them performed many interesting experiments with mediums, but are as yet undecided whether to pin their verdict in favour of the agency of disembodied spirits, or of the action of some hitherto undiscovered natural force. One of the most recent writers of this class upon Spiritualism is the Rev. Asa Mahan, D.D., first president of the Oberlin College, Ohio, and the author of several standard works on Intellectual Philosophy, Logic, Doctrine of the Will, &c., who has, in his recent work, "The Phenomena of Spiritualism Scientifically Explained and Exposed," admitted the major part of the occurrences said to be witnessed at spiritualistic seances; and they are shown to be very clearly explicable by mesmeric forces, and go to prove that spirits are in no way necessary to produce the reported results. This theory is somewhat similar to the one proposed in these pages three months since, in an article entitled "Brain Waves." Dr. Mahan substantiates his position by a vast number of well attested phenomena, and clearly shows, as we think, that some of the most wonderful spiritual manifestations are most certainly modified, if not actually caused by purely mundane influences; to such an extent, in fact, that their reliability for any practical purpose is simply *nil.* One instance with reference to an experiment tried with the great prophet of the movement, Andrew Jackson Davis, is very conclusive. It will be remembered that Mr. Davis some years since wrote, or dictated, a work while in a state of trance termed "Nature's Divine Revelations." The book professes to be scientific, but the writer manages to make some fearful blunders even in describing matters well known to astronomers and other savants. For example, the number of the asteroids is stated to be four; nearly two hundred have been already discovered; and whilst the density of the matter of Saturn is said to be about that of cork, the planet is described as being covered with large sheets of water. How the water manages to lie on the top of so light a substance is not explained. Nevertheless Mr. Davis is credited by many persons with having forecast more than one grand scientific discovery. He mentioned long before it had been seen by the telescope, that a planet existed outside the orbit of Uranus. The discovery of Neptune seemed to confirm the guess. He describes, too, the development of the sun and its attendant orbs in accordance with the nebular hypothesis with a considerable degree of exactness, and also more than hints at the existence of a central sun around which our own system is supposed to revolve. Both these last theories are now looked upon with great favour among astronomers. It somewhat detracts from the merit of these utterances of Mr. Davis that Neptune, if not seen, was believed to exist, such belief having led to the discovery; that Laplace had put forth the nebular hypothesis nearly a century before: and that Thomas Wright (see English Encyclopædia, Arts and Sciences, vol. VII. p. 666) had broached the idea of a central sun at least a hundred years previously, These opinions are confessed to have been held by philosophers; still the wonder remained how an illiterate shoemaker, such as Davis was, should have put them forth, save that he spoke by inspiration from some higher intelligence. This wonder is explained in the book before us. On one occasion the messenger of Davis, Mr. S., who was a Universalist,had an argument with a Baptist minister relative to their several ideas of future retribution. To solve the difficulty, Davis was thrown into a trance by the mesmeriser, and at once described the state of departed spirits to be such as comported exactly with the views of Universalists. "Place him in communication with me," said the Baptist. This was done, and straightway Davis described the condition of the damned in a style purely orthordox. The writer remarks, "No one can doubt the cause of these diverse and opposite visions in this case. They simply represented the ideas of those in mesmeric communication with the clairvoyant. That is all. Had he been put in communication with individuals holding every variety of sentiment that exists on earth in reference to a future state, his visions would in succession have represented them all, just as they did those of the individuals referred to, and that for the same identical reason." These remarks hold good also for the scientific opinions included in the same work. Davis himself may have never heard of Neptune, a nebular hypothesis, or a central sun; but it is not likely that his mesmeriser, an eminent scientific man, was similarly ignorant of current astronomical opinions, and Davis only acted in a reflex capacity. As an attempt to prove the reality of mesmeric influence, "Nature's Divine Revelations" is an interesting volume; as revealing anything not already in the minds of the mesmerisers, it is worth nothing. In like manner the phenomena witnessed at seances are worthy of attention as throwing a light upon certain psychological forces, although altogether useless as in any way enlightening us as to the condition of the dead.

Mr. Sydney Gibbons, at a recent meeting of the Microscopic Society, did the colony and the society itself no little service by detailing the result of his researches into a remarkable method of adulterating milk by the use of animal brains. The society will, as may be supposed, rise in favour with outsiders, because the discovery of such facts by the members plainly shows that they are not pursuing a course of merely *dilettante* studies of no practical utility. The public, too, will be great gainers, even if the name of this ingenious vendor of impure lacteal beverage is never made known. Chemical tests applied to adulterated organic substances are not always to be depended upon ; but once let our milkmen become cognizant of the fact that the wonderful lenses of Mr. Gibbons and his *confreres* are directed towards the cream retailed, with a view of detecting nerve-fibre mixed for nefarious purposes therein, and the product of the dairy is likely to be sent out tolerably pure ; not that the retailers are more honest, but that they will feel they are more likely to be detected.

It is time that science did something sensational in the way of detecting adulterations, since ever and anon come to us startling rumours of what she is doing to provide deleterious and disgusting materials for the adulterators. As an instance, a company has been formed in both New York and London for the manufacture of butter from fat. Granting that the fat used is of good quality, the practice is innocent enough. Many persons have long preferred dripping to butter, and dripping with a butter flavour imparted to it need not alarm even the most fastidious. It appears, however, that some clever scientist has discovered that an excellent substitute for the fat is to be obtained by a proper treatment of Thames mud. Nor is that all. Not long since large deposits of adipocire were found to have accumulated in the Paris graveyards from the decomposition of the dead corpses therein buried. A speculative chemist, it is said, negotiated for the purchase of the whole of this, with the view of melting it down for the manufacture of soap and candles. The process of transforming such material into palatable butter was not then in operation. The two latter facts surveyed side by side ought to afford Dr. Neild yet another argument in favour of his pet idea—the advantages of cremation.

THOMAS HARRISON.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

It will be within the recollection of our readers that at the date of the last publication of this *Review*, Parliament had adjourned for the Christmas holidays, after affirming the first of the financial resolutions of Sir J. M'Culloch, and that the Opposition, led by Mr. Graham Berry, had declared their intention of compelling the Ministry to dissolve the House by making use of the rules of parliamentary debate for the purpose of obstructing public business. We pointed out the very grave nature of the step proposed by the late Ministry, which, if successful, would involve the overthrow of constitutional government in this colony, and expressed a hope that the Administration, by the exercise of patience and discretion, would avert so lamentable a result.

We may happily congratulate our readers that our anticipations have been fulfilled, and that after the stormiest period in our political annals there has been a return to the legitimate processes of political warfare, and that there is a prospect that necessary legislation will be accomplished, and the session brought to a termination, if not glorious, yet unaccompanied by such disaster as at one time appeared imminent. Parliament re-assembled on the 11th January, when it was hoped that the Opposition would have seen the error of their ways and abandoned the unconstitutional courses they had threatened. Any such expectation was soon shown to be delusive. Sir J. M'Culloch moved without delay the resolution imposing the land tax. An obscure member of the Opposition, Mr. Tucker, having previously given notice of a motion in favour of a dissolution, Mr. Berry argued that such a notice having been tabled, involving a vote of want of confidence in the Ministry, ordinary business should, according to the usual course, be suspended. Sir James M'Culloch refused to accede to this request, on the ground that it was understood that the Opposition would not be bound by the result of the vote, and that this was only a part of the policy of obstruction threatened by them. Mr. Berry admitted the correctness of the charge, but pleaded that as the motion was to be brought forward by a member not recognised as a leader he was not required to be bound by the result. The lameness of this excuse was palpable, as if the motion were not adopted by the Opposition it could not be considered necessary to postpone other business.

Mr. Higinbotham, in one of those singular speeches by which he has been characterised during this session, made a vigorous attack on the Ministry, and urged the necessity of an opportunity being given for debating Mr. Tucker's motion, in order that the Premier might explain the formation of his Ministry, and state whether he took the responsibility of the Acting-Governor's refusal of a dissolution to Mr. Berry. The debate was continued the following evening, Messrs. Casey and Higinbotham expressing their wish to have the question of a dissolution discussed, though disclaiming any intention of supporting the "stonewall" policy of Mr. Berry and his followers. No answer was, however, attempted to Sir J. M'Culloch's objection, and Mr. Berry declared his intention to persevere in obstructing public business. The succeeding evening the forms of the House were successfully made use of in stopping the budget resolution.

The following week, on the motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply, Mr. Munro moved that the motion of Mr. Tucker should take precedence of all other business; this was negatived. On the House going into Committee of Supply, Major Smith moved, and Mr. Munro seconded, that progress be reported, and said that supplies would not be granted until the Ministry promised a dissolution. Thus the Opposition, through two of its leading members who had held office in the late Ministry, formally declared that they refused to acknowledge the decision of the majority, and would not merely prevent the policy of the Ministry being carried out, but would actually imperil the credit of the colony to gain their object.

This action has become so familiar to the public of late that we can now scarcely realise its startling character. We believe that this is the only occasion both in the Imperial and in Colonial Legislatures in which a minority has refused to be governed by the collective voice of the chamber of which it forms a part, and has endeavoured to force acquiescence in its wishes by obstructing the payment of the necessary liabilities of the country whose interests they are elected to consult.

No step could, however, have shown more conclusively the incompetence and folly of these aspirants to conduct the administration of the country, who thought it a small matter that the finances should be thrown into confusion provided they had a chance of returning to office.

Had the Opposition merely tried to "stonewall" the financial policy of the Ministry, it is possible that the attempt, though foolish, might have met with some success; but the obvious iniquity of jeopardising the credit of the colony, for the sake of party or personal interests, arrayed against them many who would otherwise have given the Ministry a lukewarm or faltering support.

On January 20th, the Opposition gained their wish of having a vote taken as to the desirability of a dissolution, and were defeated on the question by eight votes. In the debate on the previous evening Mr. Berry made the remarkable admission that he had committed an error in taking office after the Acting-Governor had refused to accept the advice of the Kerferd Ministry as to a dissolution, thus confessing his inability to foresee the political bearings of his actions.

On Tuesday in the following week, the Opposition continued to use the forms of the House to prevent supplies being passed, and the patience of members being at last exhausted, on January 26th the Premier took the first step to overthrow the "stonewall" by moving that during the remainder of the session Government business should be called on not later than five o'clock. In an able speech on this occasion, Mr. Service pithily showed the folly of obstructing the passage of supplies, as he said there could be only two possible reasons for "stonewalling" supplies. Either the thing to be stonewalled must be itself a bad thing, or it must be stonewalled as the only means of preventing some other wrong being committed; obviously, paying the public creditor was no wrong, and the budget, if wrong, could be effectually obstructed by stonewalling the financial resolutions. After a stormy sitting, lasting from Thursday afternoon till eleven o'clock on Friday morning, the Opposition gave way, and the resolution was passed.

On February 8th Sir James M'Culloch at last took a more decisive step towards terminating the deadlock, by moving what became known as the Iron-hand resolution, viz., a new standing order that on any member moving that the question before the House be now put, the Speaker or Chairman of Committees should forthwith, without debate, put the motion, and on this being affirmed a vote on the original question should be taken without debate.

This no doubt is a grave innovation on the freedom of discussion, and has met with the disapprobation of the weightiest authority on constitutional law in this colony. There is great force in his argument that the proper way to meet an abuse of the rules of debate is to alter those particular rules which are liable to abuse, instead of introducing a new rule of so comprehensive a character as the one under review; but it must be borne in mind that the object the Premier was bound to effect was not to revise the rules of debate so as to remedy in the best possible manner a possible abuse, but to find out a speedy and certain remedy for a serious and pressing emergency.

It would have been merely playing into the hands of the Opposition had he brought down a series of amendments on the several standing orders relating to the rights of debate in the House and in its several Committees, and the temper of the Assembly was not such as to give any reasonable hope that wise and reasonable amendments would have been carried.

The Iron-hand resolution is in force for the session only, and we hope that, instead of renewing it next session, the whole House will calmly and amicably take in hand the very necessary work of so revising the rules of parliamentary debate as to leave a minority the right to freely and fully discuss any question before the House, while depriving them of the power of obstructing the passage of a measure after it has been debated.

It appears that a standing order similar to the Iron-hand resolution is in force in the legislative bodies in the United States, in France, and in South Australia, and it does not appear to have been abused hitherto; but this is surely a most inadequate reason for altering our time-honoured rules and permanently giving a majority of the House an unnecessary power.

As might be expected, the proposal met with violent denunciation from the Opposition, and various points of order were raised; they were, however, overruled by the Speaker; and after a turbulent sitting of about forty-eight hours, the resolution was carried by a majority of 41 to 20, the Opposition having mismanaged their amendments and allowed the Ministry an opportunity of putting the question.

The Premier had to keep together various parties, differing from one another on fundamental questions; and undue haste or apparent harshness would have split the various sections of his followers and left the victory with the Opposition.

On the 15th February a Supply bill was passed, and the House proceeded to consider the budget resolutions, the second of these, imposing a bank note duty, and the fourth, increasing the succession duties, passed without difficulty; the first and third, dealing with the land and income taxes, met with considerable opposition, and were debated at some length. The chief objection raised to the resolution imposing a land tax was that, town lands being included, a check would be given to building and other improvements. The answer to this is obvious, though it was not very plainly stated in debate: any tax is inevitably, to a certain extent, a discouragement to industry; the tax on country lands would have a slight tendency to check the erection of substantial fences, and the clearing and cultivation of the ground, just as the house tax might slightly depreciate the value of town property, or the income tax would slightly diminish the desire to earn more than the exempt minimum. The resolution relating to the house and land tax was carried by a majority of four only. It was afterwards recommitted and amended, so that land should be taken apart from buildings, the latter being liable under the income tax resolution.

The debate on the income tax was characterised by some able speeches from Messrs. Service, Langton, and R. Murray Smith. The first of these gentlemen urged some weighty reasons against the adoption of the Ministerial scheme, and though unsuccessful in opposing the resolution, a second speech when the bill was brought in contributed to its withdrawal; the resolution was carried by a majority of 9 (37 to 28).

The second reading of the bill embodying the resolutions as to the land, property, and income taxes was taken on the 23rd March, when it appeared that members who had approved of the last-named tax in theory became alarmed at the reality, with all the details as to collection, and the second reading was passed by a majority of three only. On the next day Sir James M'Culloch intimated that the Government would withdraw the bill, content themselves with passing the Appropriation Act and a bill authorising the issue of Treasury bills to meet the deficiency for the year, and close the session, taking the recess to mature their scheme of taxation.

On the whole, this appears to be the only course left open to them. No doubt the narrow majority on the bill embodying the principal features of the budget has seriously impaired their prestige, and would, in ordinary circumstances, render a dissolution or a change of Ministry the proper action; but it would be folly to adopt the latter course, as it is clear that no Ministry could be formed having as large a support as that of Sir James M'Culloch; and the former course would be objectionable, as the Ministry may find it necessary to amend their scheme of taxation when the recess shall have afforded them leisure for revising the expenditure in the various departments, and more accurate estimates have been arrived at as to the income to be raised by their several proposals, and it is but just that the present Parliament should have an opportunity of pronouncing on their matured fiscal scheme. The financial position of the colony is certainly sufficiently serious. It appears from a statement of the Premier that there is a prospect of a deficiency of £186,000 on the 30th June, notwithstanding that the revenue has been £92,000 above his estimate in November; the annual expenditure of the colony having reached the enormous sum of £4,700,000.

The first and most urgent business of the Government during the recess should be to mature a comprehensive scheme for reducing our extravagant and ever increasing expenditure; not by cutting down a salary here and there and amalgamating a few offices, but by going through the expenditure of the several departments, and considering what should be self-supporting, and what duties should be properly undertaken by local bodies.

In the first category we should place the post-office as far as relates to inland letters. The duty of transmitting news falls in no way under the sphere of Government; it is simply a commercial undertaking which can be more conveniently managed by the State than by private companies; there is no more reason why the Government should transmit letters and papers at less than the cost price of carriage than why it should assume a monopoly of the corn trade and sell bread at a loss, as was done under the Roman Republic, or than why it should administer justice at less than the cost price, the fact being that at present it makes a profit out of it. Before a telegraph office is opened at a country town, we believe a guarantee is required that the department shall not incur a loss; we see no reason why this rule should not be adopted in regard to post-offices.

The local government subsidy again, exceeding £300,000, should certainly be raised by the local bodies who expend it. While the income arising from customs duties was more than sufficient to defray the expenses of the central Government, and before railways were constructed, it was reasonable that the surplus should be devoted to building bridges and making main roads; but it is irrational that the central Government should impose a land tax to be returned to the local bodies to be spent by them in improving their properties. If they consider the good gained commensurate with the cost, let them raise the rate themselves; they are the best judges.

Again, the charitable vote is expended by local bodies, who are irresponsible to Government for its use; the money would be far more carefully spent were it raised by local taxation. These questions ought to be carefully considered, before a system of *direct* taxation is adopted. The incidental gains arising from decentralisation would be no less important than the direct ones. Ratepayers being more directly interested in the raising and expenditure of revenue, local bodies would become more careful to select competent and trustworthy agents to manage their finances; these again, having to deal with larger financial transactions, would obtain experience which would be useful when, as is frequently the case, they are elected as members for the district. The members of the Assembly again would be freed from irksome local duties, and more time would be gained for considering national concerns.

If members would honestly apply themselves to the task of cutting down improper expenses, they would find that their constituencies would hesitate to reject them in favour of untried candidates, who made larger promises.

The portion of the session under review has been characterised by such scenes of violence and abuse as it is to be hoped will not soon be witnessed again. Two ex-Ministers on the Opposition side distinguished themselves by their intemperate language, characterising the House as corrupt and the Speaker or Chairman of Committees as corrupt and guilty of favouritism. In the one case an apology was accepted; in the other the offender was committed to the custody of the Sergeant-at-arms. The demoralised condition of the House was shown by the fact that in both cases the punishment of the offender was made a party question, and the Opposition were willing to sacrifice the dignity of the House for the sake of embarrassing the Government.

One remark of Sir Charles M'Mahon during the debate is worthy of consideration; he stated that in the Imperial Parliament the Speaker had the assistance of standing counsel as to points of order and procedure; here, as he was without that aid, he assumed the law offices of the Crown were right, and consequently that any Government motion was properly brought forward. If this is the case, it is a farce to go through the form of raising points of order, and the Opposition had some reason for discontent at all the points of order raised by them being overruled. It would tend to raise the respect of the House for their chairman, and enable him to exercise more effective control over debates were the practice of the Imperial

Parliament followed, so that the Speaker would not be the mere mouth-piece of the Ministry for the time being.

Of extra-parliamentary affairs the one that has excited most interest has been the inquiry into the management of the Mining Department. This shows the necessity for the Public Service Bill so long promised, so that such supernumeraries as are competent and are permanently required may not be liable to dismissal or degradation at the caprice of the head of a department or of a Minister. Credit is due to the Government for appointing a board of inquiry which commands thorough confidence, a fact which should be a matter of course, but which unfortunately is not always so.

The inquiry into the management of the Kew Asylum shows the necessity for more rigorous supervision in Government departments, and seems to indicate that the enormous sum spent over the huge pile which crowns the heights of Kew has been to a great extent thrown away, since it is now being recognised that the cottage and boarding-out system is the most beneficial for the unfortunate occupants of such asylums.

The report of the Volunteer Commission has been published after the commission have been sitting at intervals for nearly twelve months. It is not of a reassuring character. The old story is retold of extravagant expenditure, without any definite aims, and very little result. Our land batteries are in ruins, our naval defences are half manned, our land forces are unarmed, our officers are improperly chosen, and this grand result has cost nearly £1,000,000. The Commissioners propose a remodelled volunteer force, but they omit to state what object the force is to serve in case of what the commission call the most probable, or we might say the only possible danger, that is, 'an attack by hostile cruisers who might make a sudden dart into the port, destroy the shipping, and lay the city under contribution, and then retire.' Are the volunteers to be marched to the Sandridge pier, or the Williamstown Breakwater to pick off the gunners who are bombarding the town? We fail to see any other use for them; and the field artillery and cavalry would have still less opportunity of covering themselves with glory.

In considering our proper defence, we must first consider our peculiar circumstances—our most vulnerable point of attack. This undeniably consists in so large a proportion of the wealth and population of the colony being centred in one maritime city, Melbourne. Were our population distributed over scores of seaports and inland towns; or even if centred in one place were the metropolis built on some river at a considerable distance from the coast, our volunteer infantry, cavalry, and artillery would have a *raison d'être*; in the one case an enemy having bombarded one town would have to march to another, in the other case they would have to land a force to take the capital; under either supposition a volunteer force could harass and possibly destroy them. But looking at our actual position, it is evident that an enemy could gain everything desired without landing a man, consequently our obvious policy is to concentrate our whole war expenditure on the naval defences, the Cerberus, and some other floating battery. Certainly it may be maintained that it is worth while to incur some expense for the sake of the physical education our volunteers receive, and the lessons of prompt obedience they learn. This may be true, but it should be distinctly understood that our land volunteer force is not maintained for defensive purposes.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

"The Student's English Grammar," by Charles H. Pearson, M.A., late fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, and some time Professor of Modern History in King's College, London; and Herbert A. Strong, M.A., Oxon, Professor of Classics in the University of Melbourne. S. Mullen, 1876.

In estimating the value of a text book on grammar, a needful preliminary is a consideration of the purpose to be served by a study of this subject in schools. This is the more necessary, as education has always clung closely to tradition; and certain branches of learning having been once selected as suitable objects for training the mind, have ever since remained in the school curriculum. Now the study of grammar at school may be justified on two grounds. First, though it will not enable a child to speak and write correctly, as the old grammars used to assert, any more than the study of logic will make a man an acute reasoner, yet the rules it lays down enable a child to give a name to and classify any errors to which his ear or his eye at first directs attention, and qualifies him to choose the preferable of two customary modes of expression. Secondly, it trains the mind in the habit of observation and classification, and from this point of view ranks with the study of the natural sciences, such as botany and mineralogy, while it possesses the great advantage over them that the subjects with which it deals—words—are those with which the mind becomes very early acquainted, and of which there is a large variety and number to observe and experiment on.

The older grammarians confined their attention to the first and more practical of these two objects, consequently the classification of words was made in reference to syntax or the modes of their arrangement only, and the bulk of the older text books dealt with this portion of the subject. Of late years this course has been reversed; numerous subdivisions of the great classes of names are given, even though these are not alluded to in treating of the arrangement of words; and the history of names and the changes they undergo are dealt with at length, though they have little bearing on the rules of syntax. This change, provided it be not carried too far, may be justified in consideration of the importance of the second end of the study of grammar.

Stated shortly, Messrs. Pearson and Strong's grammar is a distinct advance on treatises of a similar size as regards the classification, and still more the history and changes of words. The chapters which treat of the various uses of the several pronouns, prepositions and conjunctions, their derivation, and gradually diverging meanings, are admirably done. That on the history of the changes of language abounds in acute remarks, and is calculated to rouse the student's curiosity and induce him to carry on the study for himself. We think the authors of this grammar have done wisely in reducing the number of subdivisions of nouns, adjectives and adverbs, which in such treatises as Morell's renders the study of grammar needlessly tedious.

When we turn to the portion of the work devoted to syntax, we must express some regret at the rather meagre manner in which this is treated.

Any scheme of parsing ought surely to be so framed as to be a test of a solecism, just as in logic the reduction of an argument to a series of syllogisms enables the reasoner to detect any illegitimate inference; yet strange to say, parsing, according to the sample given in this grammar, would fail to detect so gross an error as a subject in the singular joined to a verb in the plural, or a pronoun in the nominative governed by a verb. The sentence given as an example, is the first in Hamlet's oft quoted soliloquy, "To be or not to be," &c., and the sample parsing does not state the subject of either finite verb "is," the government of "question," "to suffer," &c. This certainly does not accord with the authors' definition, "to parse a word means to give an accurate account of its etymology and syntax."

In the scheme of analysis, Mason's system is pretty closely followed; it is, however, simplified, and, we think, improved. We would suggest that in any subsequent edition the chapter on parsing should succeed those on analysis and syntax; since the rules given under the last named heads are required to perform the first operation successfully.

A useful addition to the grammar would be a chapter on the pathology of language, showing children how the various rules and definitions they have been at so much trouble to learn may be applied to detect errors and inaccuracies in written and spoken sentences. Such a chapter is, we think, as necessary in a grammar as a book on fallacies is in a treatise on logic.

We are surprised to notice the absence of any remarks on punctuation and orthography. Since grammar deals with written as well as spoken language, both of these come legitimately within its province; and they demand the more attention as, though a man may speak correctly by nature, or rather by association and habit, nothing but much practice and a knowledge of rules will enable him to spell and punctuate properly. While undertaking the ungrateful task of fault finding, we would suggest that in any subsequent edition which may be called for the writers should correct a few inaccuracies which have crept into their own language. *Exempli gratia*: "A name which denotes *more than one thing* is said to be in the plural." Would not most collective names be included in this definition? "Risks to be contradicted" (p. 84) is an awkward expression. "A preposition differs from a verb because it cannot take a noun or pronoun before it; it differs from a conjunction because it takes a noun after it." Such phrases as "the House of Parliament," "Tom and Harry," are examples of the violation of the two rules as stated here, yet we think they are both common and correct expressions. "Shalst" and "wilst" (p. 86), we presume, are printer's errors.

In conclusion, we may express a hope that the authors will carry out their intention of publishing the other two parts of their work on the English language, of which we understand this is only a part, and that the public will show their appreciation of the manner in which these gentlemen are undertaking the rather irksome and ungrateful, though necessary, work of improving our school-books.

SPEECHES ON VARIOUS OCCASIONS CONNECTED WITH THE PUBLIC AFFAIRS OF NEW SOUTH WALES, 1848–1874, by Henry Parkes, with an introduction by David Blair. Melbourne, George Robertson, 1876.

THE speeches of Mr. Henry Parkes form a handsome and well printed volume of 464 pages, and as their editor remarks, the publication is a novelty in colonial literature, and one that marks the political growth of these colonies.

Although many of the subjects treated of in its pages are from their nature more likely to be interesting to our neighbours of the adjoining colony than to the people of Victoria, yet a glance through the table of contents will show that many questions are dealt with which possess an interest and importance far transcending the boundaries of any one colony.

Taxation and Free-trade, the Eight Hours' Movement, the Defence of the Colonies, the Federation of the Colonies, Public Education, are subjects which belong as much to Victorian politics as to those of New South Wales; and the reader will find them treated with the vigour and originality which characterise one of the most distinguished of Australian statesmen. Apart too from the intrinsic interest of these subjects, it is in the highest degree desirable that the people of this colony should know how political problems, many of which they are themselves striving hard to solve, are dealt with by our neighbours; as such knowledge will tend to counteract that growing disposition to a narrow provincialism, which more than any other of our local defects we ought carefully to guard against. We shall not in the present short notice attempt to criticise either the political opinions or the oratorical powers of Mr. Parkes, as evinced in the volume before us, but shall conclude by recommending our readers to study its pages for themselves, believing that they will find it, as we have done, both an interesting memorial of a distinguished colonial statesman, and a valuable contribution to the history of the oldest of the Australian colonies.

J. AND A. M'KINLEY, PRINTERS, QUEEN STREET, MELBOURNE.

THE

MELBOURNE ATHENÆUM.

LIBRARY AND READING ROOMS,

COLLINS STREET EAST,

IMMEDIATELY ABOVE THE TOWN HALL AND OPPOSITE THE "ARGUS" OFFICE.

IN the principal Reading Room will be found Newspapers from all parts of Victoria and the neighbouring Colonies; the leading London and Provincial papers are laid on the tables immediately on the arrival of the English Mail Steamer.

The supply of Magazines and Periodicals, scientific, artistic, literary and amusing, is most complete, and includes every publication of note, either Home or Colonial. Of the more popular, two or more copies are supplied. These may be borrowed by members.

There is a separate Reading Room for Ladies, supplied with suitable newspapers and periodicals. Subscription per annum, Ten Shillings.

The Library is divided into two Departments—the Circulating Library and a Library of Reference. The former contains between 15,000 and 16,000 volumes which are lent to members and their families. New works are being constantly added. To many the Library of Reference will be found of value, as it contains such works as Parliamentary Proceedings, Gazettes, Encyclopædias, Men of the Time, Directories, the best Etymological and Scientific Dictionaries, &c. &c.

A room is provided for conversation, smoking, chess, &c.

Classes are held during the week, at convenient times, for instruction in French, Italian, Chemistry, Singing, Dancing, Elocution, Phonography, the subjects for the Civil Service and Matriculation Examinations, &c., to which members are admitted at a reduced scale of fees.

Lectures, on various subjects, are delivered in the course of the year, at certain of which members are privileged to attend at reduced charges.

The Subscription to the Institution, entitling a member to the whole of these advantages, is £1 per annum, or Ten Shillings half-yearly. No Entrance Fee is charged. Members can join at any period of the year.

Any further information that may be desired will be gladly rendered on application, at the Institution, to

GARNET WALCH, *Secretary.*

THE

MELBOURNE REVIEW.

No. 3.—July, 1876.

JOURNEY TO THE ARFAK MOUNTAINS, NEW GUINEA, BY SIGNOR L. M. D'ALBERTIS.

[That active and energetic traveller, Signor L. M. D'Albertis, whose visit of "A month among the Papuans of the Arfak Mountains of New Guinea" I am about to relate from the extracts of his journal, has, on the 20th of April, 1876, left Sydney, N.S.W., in the mail steamer Brisbane for Somerset, from that place to proceed in an open steam launch on the perilous enterprise of exploring the Fly River to its source, having already attained the distance of 150 miles previously in the missionary steamer, the Ellangowan. The Government of New South Wales have very liberally lent him an excellent steam launch, the Neva, with the necessary outfit, and a few of the colonists have subscribed upwards of £400 for the payment of the crew, the private means of Mr. D'Albertis supplying the personal outfit. A brief biography of this enterprising explorer and distinguished naturalist, as a preface to his explorations in New Guinea, may be interesting at the present time. Luigi M. D'Albertis, Fellow of the Italian Geographical Society, Corr. Mem. Zoological Society of London, &c., &c., belongs to a distinguished and ancient family of Florence, and was born in Genoa, Italy, on the 21st of November, 1841. He studied at Turin for the army, which, however, he renounced from the opposition of his parents, who belonged to the old Catholic party. The political changes that took place in the years 1859 and 1860, and the success of the great General Garibaldi, called upon the young and liberal Italians to take up arms against foreign oppression, or the lesser tyrants who were desirous of dividing Italy among themselves. Mr. D'Albertis could not refrain from answering to this appeal of Garibaldi, and, as a volunteer, he entered and fought the battles for the Independence of Italy. After the war was concluded, to finish his education he visited England, Scotland, Ireland, and also France, Belgium, and Switzerland; but his ardent disposition was soon tired of Europe, and desired a more extensive and less known field for his exertions in sporting and in collecting specimens of natural history, and observing birds and other animals in their native haunts. At this time he became acquainted with the celebrated French traveller and naturalist, the Abbé Armand David, whose researches in natural history in China are so well known in Europe. It was he who inspired Mr. D'Albertis with the love of the science of natural history, and advised him to visit for that purpose the Eastern Archipelago and the little explored country of New Guinea. In 1871 he decided to accompany Dr. C. Beccari, the celebrated botanist, whom he met at Genoa in November 1871, who was pleased to have as his companion so enthusiastic a hunter and explorer as D'Albertis. They arrived at Singapore in January, 1872, and subsequently pursued their botanical and zoological investigations in the Malayan Archipelago. They then visited Java, and at Buitenzorg (according to an account published in the *Cosmos*, edited by Signor Cora,) they fell in with the naturalist Teijsman, who had only a month before returned from a four days' visit to the coast of New Guinea, on board the Dasson, in the Dutch expedition which had so completely failed, as well in its scientific as its political intention. The Italian travellers were recommended to try the Western Coast, but they had fixed their minds on Utanata. They found it impossible to gain any local information at Amboyna, and were further assured that in about six weeks the winds would render it useless to make the attempt. They took into their service one Amboynese who had been to New Guinea with Rosenberg, and with Signor Cerutti to Maclure Bay when he had been attacked by the Papuans, and another who had been with Alfred R. Wallace, the celebrated naturalist. They hired the same little schooner which had served Rosenberg, and fitted her with provisions for several months. Notwithstanding their passports had been duly *vised*, there was considerable suspicion among the people, official and otherwise, that their expedition was a secret and political one, and it was after a good deal of trouble that at length all seemed settled. But now another unfortunate difficulty arose. The Chinese captain of the schooner repented of his bargain, and urged his ignorance of the coast and his fear of the inhabitants. Not to be daunted, they succeeded in persuading him to let them have another little vessel belonging to him, which was commanded by a daring fellow who had volunteered to accompany them, and who happily discovered for them two men who had been to Utanata, and spoke the dialect of the natives there. So they sailed on the 21st of March, 1872, with every prospect of being shut out from the civilised world for eight or ten months. In the voyage from Amboyna to Sarong, which lasted till the 30th of April, the travellers set foot on several places not previously visited by Europeans. After D'Albertis had visited the Arfak mountains, and other parts of New Guinea, he was compelled to leave that interesting country from repeated attacks of fever, and embarked in the Italian frigate Vettore Pisani, commanded by Count Guiseppe Lovera, which ship left Orangarie Bay, New Guinea, on the 10th of January, and arrived at Sydney, N. S. Wales, on the 1st of February, 1873. Mr. D'Albertis remained at Sydney several months, for the recovery of his health, and then left for London, *via* San Francisco, in the mail steamer. He remained for two months at Honolulu, Sandwich Islands, and arrived in England early in 1874, with his splendid collection of Natural History in every branch, a large portion of which was entirely new to science. A portion of the ornithological collection, which he had sent to the Zoological Society of London, was found by Dr. Sclater to consist of four new genera, and sixteen new species of birds, including two new Birds of Paradise, the beautiful Drepanornis Albertisi, and the splendid Paradisea Raggiana, allied to the Red Bird of Paradise (P. Rubra). Dr. Beccari remained in New Guinea. Mr. D'Albertis disposed of his entire collection to the Italian Government, on condition of its being placed entire in the museum of his native city, Genoa. After a short stay in Europe he prepared for another voyage to New Guinea, and at the end of the year 1874 he left Italy for Somerset, Cape York, and soon after his arrival left in the cutter Ida, Captain Redlish, for Yule Island, south-east coast of New Guinea, where he established his head quarters for expeditions into the interior. The first ascent of the Arfak mountains was accomplished by Mr. D'Albertis, and it was there he discovered the new Bird of Paradise, Drepanornis Albertisi, described by Dr. Sclater in 1873, as well as several other new species of birds. The account of the ascent of the Mount Arfak, from his journals, is as follows.—GEORGE BENNETT, M.D.]

After arriving at Andai, a small village about ten miles from Dorey, and near the foot of Mount Arfak, I was desirous of ascending the mountain, both in the expectation of making some good zoological collections, as well as to improve my state of health. I therefore opened a negotiation with the natives of Andai, in which I was aided by a Dutch Missionary, who received me very amicably, and entered warmly into my arrangements. From the commencement the difficulties met with were not great, and the Corano, or Chief, of Andai was disposed to procure me the natives who would be required to carry my baggage. The Corano among the natives of Mount Arfak bears a certain degree of authority, which, however, appears to confer dignity rather than real power, since he is more the adviser than the master, for should the natives refuse to obey his commands he has not the power to enforce them. The month of August was rapidly passing away, and no final arrangement had yet been made; at length, by the aid of presents to the Corano, and payment promised to the natives who were to accompany me, on arriving at our destination, I succeeded in obtaining six to go to Atam, a populous village on the mountain. I ascertained also that a Corano was residing there with whom I had already been acquainted at Andai, having met him there a few days after my arrival. There are many people from Arfak among the inhabitants of Andai, who come down to the Dutch Missionary, and establish themselves there; four out of the six natives I had engaged to accompany me were Arfaks from Atam. An early hour on the morning of the 4th of September, 1872, was fixed for our departure, when the Corano came with only four men; however, the two missing men were soon replaced by two others. At half-past seven a.m. we took our departure, Dr. Beccari remaining with the Dutch missionary. After having crossed a small creek in a canoe from Andai, we entered into the forest. One of the natives took his wife with him, who had a child seven or eight years old with her. The natives that I had engaged at Amboyna could not accompany us, as they were all dangerously ill. I took with me a Malay named David, who had formerly been a slave, but was now free; he was nominally a Christian, but was not a character of good repute; he was very useful to me as an interpreter, speaking both the Malayan and Papuan languages; my escort, therefore, consisted of eight persons. The woman took a portion of her husband's luggage, and, together with her own, was by far more loaded than he was, and had a load more fit for a strong man than a woman in a pregnant state, as she was at the time. The men were armed with bows and arrows, and had a weapon called Parang, which is a large knife, narrow near the handle, and enlarged towards the extremity of the blade; some had also spears.

After having walked for about an hour and a half on level ground we arrived at a steep and rugged hill, which we ascended with difficulty by a narrow pathway, most fatiguing to walk over, and we were all silent, as the men and woman were too heavily loaded to talk on such a road. The forest around was monotonous and gloomy, not being enlivened by the cheerful harmony of birds, but the stillness was broken occasionally by the loud and deep cooing of pigeons, and the hoarse voice of the Black Megapodius (Megapodius Freycinettii). One of the latter I shot for my dinner for the day, as I had brought only half a dozen yams and some sago as provision for myself, depending upon my gun for a supply of animal food. After arriving at the summit of the hill we walked for nearly an hour across a plain, level, forest country; we then descended by a very difficult path, near a stream of water, deliciously clear and fresh; we made a brief halt at this place, the men receiving their rations of sago, which they prepared for their meal with water from the stream. We afterwards continued our journey by the same road, still ascending many hills, which gradually increased in elevation, and the road became more and more difficult. I watched for and saw several Birds of Paradise, the beautiful Paradisea papuana, who flew screaming out its discordant notes, among the more elevated branches of the trees, which were less dense and not so lofty as those at a lower elevation. The large Crowned Pigeons (Goura coronata) were very numerous, and I succeeded in killing three. At 4 p.m. we had attained an elevation of 1500 feet above the level of the sea, which was visible to the east not very far distant from us. After a short descent we found ourselves in an extensive bed of a watercourse, at this season nearly dry. Judging from the size of the bed at this time, a great portion of which was covered by shrubs, reeds, and rushes, and from the great quantity of huge blocks of stones scattered about, I should consider that at one period of time the fall of water at this place must have been of great magnitude, and that these mountains had at one time experienced a great convulsion of nature. The mountain, whose base is laved by the waters of this stream, is in some parts perpendicular, and at others the reverse. From the time that we left Andai, we had not met any natives, but now I was surprised at meeting a woman, who fled immediately that she perceived me. My astonishment increased on seeing a number of natives descend from the mountain to the place where she had evidently directed them; they also appeared from among the reeds and shrubs, and emerged from behind the rocks; indeed from such places as I never should have supposed could have afforded concealment or egress to any human being; for hearing voices behind me, and returning, I perceived coming out of the bed of the stream as if by magic, emerging from behind the large stones of the watercourse, men, women, children, dogs, pigs, and I then found myself among a nomad tribe. The men were all armed with bows and arrows, and with the parang, and some weapons were also carried by the women and children. The men wore an ornamental band over the forehead, called by them Lueza; it was formed from a slip of the bark of a tree; it was very supple, and ornamented in front with small white shells arranged in an elliptical form, the bark narrowing behind like a ribbon, and was tied at the back of the head. They had the nose pierced, and in the orifice they inserted the Ztigau, which consists of a small circular piece of white shell, finely polished, sometimes adorned by little red circles of some kind of bark; the size and length of the Ztigau varies from one to six inches; sometimes the women replaced the Ztigau by a disc of shell that they named Brée. The rings for the ears are made in a similar manner, and very often three or four of these ornaments (Brée) adorn the forehead of both men and women. The Brée is sometimes plain, sometimes worked with ornamental designs, which occasion the natives much labour and time, as they have to use the parang for the purpose; if they have no other ornament, it is not unusual for them to place cigars, entire or half used, in the lobe of the ears, or in the septum of the nose; the cigars are made by them with a little tobacco rolled up in a leaf, generally that of the Pandanus, with which both the men and women appear to be generally well provided.

Some of the natives approached and were very friendly and inquisitive about me, others kept at a distance, forming, as they clustered on rocks of the watercourse, small picturesque groups. The women were very timid; they also formed groups among themselves, and the frightened children remained with them. I ascertained from the interpreter that they were natives of the mountains, who were returning from the sea-shore, where they go occasionally to procure salt, which they extract from the ashes of some plants that grow in those localities. Some of them were friends of my men, and they arranged that we should pass the night with them, their habitations being not far distant. On taking leave of those who were going by another road to various places on the mountain, we gave them some tobacco. I then began to ascend with the other natives to their dwelling, which was situated about 500 feet above the watercourse, by the pathway by which I had seen them descend. I found the forest was still of a gloomy character, but at some places was relieved by portions being cleared and planted with sugar cane and bananas. From my elevated position I enjoyed at sunset a most magnificent and extensive view of the sea, the Island of Mansinam seeming under a glow of fire, produced by the reflection of the sun upon it, while the chorus of a variety of birds saluted the passing day. The house in which I was to pass the night was built of a size sufficiently large for four families; it was constructed on the trunks of trees of some elevation, and was entered by a long ladder made from branches of trees. I was kindly received and presented with sugar cane, and in return I gave them some tobacco. After my supper I slept soundly in spite of the incessant talking of my hosts. The next day (Sept. 5th) I wished to start at daylight, but to this my men objected, as they wished to remain to cook their bananas, and get a supply of sugar cane; however, we managed to start by 8 a.m., the chief of the house and some of the women accompanying us. We again descended to the watercourse previously mentioned and then left it again, taking to the right the ascent of Mount Putat; we were protected from the heat of the sun by the shelter of large and umbrageous trees. By noon we arrived at the summit, and found four houses, inhabited by from forty to fifty natives; this formed the village of Putat. On looking round to the north east, a great part of the coast of Dorey was seen, as well as the Island of Mansinam; to the west a great extent of land, probably an immense wooded plain, appeared in the distance, as a long line; to the south-south-west rose some high mountains, covered by a dense and luxuriant vegetation. Not far from the habitations I found an oak (Quercus sp.) both the foliage and fruit of which resembled the European species. About an hour after my arrival, considering my men had rested sufficiently, I ordered our departure, when to my surprise they informed me that we had arrived at Atam, and that they did not intend to proceed any further. At first I thought they were joking, but I was soon convinced they were in earnest. What could I do? They did not fear my anger, for they knew very well they had the advantage of me in numbers, and my promises of a larger remuneration went for nothing, for they were quite content with what they had been promised; further, they now demanded payment, which I refused, telling them at the same time that they would receive nothing until we arrived at Atam. To convince them that they could not deceive me, I had recourse to stratagem, saying, with my pocket barometer in my hand, "I know where Atam is situated, as this instrument exactly indicates its position, marking the height more or less; Atam is at such a height, so that you will understand that I will only pay you on our arrival at Atam." They then asked me to prove what I said. I consented; and having first ascended the mountain, so as to have a sensible variation in the barometer, they asked me several times to show them the instrument, this I did; when they were preparing to descend the mountain they marked it, and on arriving again at the village they observed the variation that had taken place. I succeeded by this stratagem, and it was concluded by their promising me that they would leave to-morrow if I would take more men, as they were overloaded, and not well acquainted with the road; to this I consented. The remainder of the day I occupied myself in collecting Coleoptera (beetles) and other insects, in which I was aided by the women and children. I rewarded them with Venetian beads, which they named by the Malay appellation of mani, mani, and highly valued. At 7 a.m. on the following morning, I left the village of Putat, my escort being increased by twenty men, women, and children, but only five were paid by me, the others coming as followers; there was among them a little girl six or seven years old, who led the way, but she would not be on friendly terms with me, but cried and screamed when I looked at her; it was in vain that I gave her presents, it made no difference to her affections; she had on her shoulders a small net bag, called by them nockin, which the natives take with them when travelling; in this bag she carried some provisions, and a very little dog, remarkably ugly, but a great favourite with her; she carried in her hand a small branch of a tree, with which she cleared away from each side of the bushes, the dense spiders' webs which often obstructed the pathway; she was followed by her sister, a little girl younger than herself; their mother accompanied them. She was a young woman, robust, of a good complexion, with hair of a reddish colour, and very bright eyes. In comparison with her female companions, she would be considered pretty; she was followed by other women all carrying their net bags (nockin) and armed with spears, which served them as staffs to walk with over the rugged pathways. Among them I observed a girl about fifteen years old, who at first I thought was a child, but who I afterwards found out was wife of one of my men, who was about thirty-five years old; the colour of her skin was more black and glossy than that of the other women, her eyes were brilliant, under long eyelashes, and the teeth being beautifully white made a great contrast with her deep ebony colours; ornaments of hells were intermingled with her hair, and, dropping elegantly over her forehead, formed a handsome decoration; a necklace, also formed of white shells, fell gracefully resting on her bosom. Her form was elegant, and she was graceful in all her movements, and very intelligent. She had an agreeable vivacity, her smile was sweet and agreeable, and her voice was harmonious and pleasing to hear. From time to time she would sing a wild chant of a peculiar character, which had the effect of exciting the energies of her companions; she, as well as the others, carried a nockin, or net bag. She was always cheerful, and never appeared to be tired. The dress of these people is very simple, consisting merely of narrow slips either of calico or bark, both before and behind, tied round the waist by a thin cord, which is generally invisible. They wear, however, a great number of bangles or bracelets made of shell or brass. On descending we passed several kobons or plantations, in which yams, bananas, maize, and tobacco were under cultivation. After taking most of the day descending the mountain, we again entered a forest of magnificent trees, and of a rich tropical vegetation, though not so dense as to prevent our seeing a great distance over the country, which did not appear to be very thickly covered by trees or bushes. So far there appeared to be a great scarcity of birds, as I neither saw nor heard any. We at length arrived at the bed of a watercourse of far greater extent than any we had yet seen, but with very little water flowing. In one of the small streams which run at the base of Mount Putat, we had found clear and fresh water, but here we passed an almost dry watercourse, while the scorching rays of the sun, made it very oppressive. The rocks were so hot that they could not be touched by the hand. We were now only 700 or 800 feet above the level of the sea, but as we advanced up the rugged bed of the watercourse we sensibly gained a greater elevation. After walking for nearly three hours we left this rough road, and turning to the right, following a south-west direction, we entered a pass between two high mountains, the shelter of which relieved us from the intense heat of the sun. About noon we arrived at a small stream of fresh water, where we rested for refreshment. The Papuans availed themselves of this opportunity to bathe and wash their bushy hair, an operation which they frequently performed when an opportunity offered during the journey. Disagreeable as it may be to walk over the rocky bed of a river when dry, under the heat of a tropical sun, I nevertheless preferred it to the rugged, steep pathway we had now before us; my strength, enfeebled by a slight attack of fever in the night, almost failed me; but at length I arrived at the summit of the mountain, and the road become much easier to walk over. Below we beheld the same forest, but around us were only tree ferns, bamboos, and various kinds of shrubs. At certain intervals during the journey the sea was visible at some distance, both in the south-east and north-east; to the north-west a great extent of fine country was seen. At half-past two p.m. we experienced heavy rain, but were obliged to continue our journey from being unable to obtain any shelter, and the path becoming boggy and slippery materially impeded our progress. Very fortunately about five we arrived at an elevated spot, where we found two small bark huts; they were uninhabited, and appeared to have served in emergencies similar to ours, as a temporary shelter from the inclemency of the weather. It was proposed by the natives to remain at this place for the night, to which I readily assented. Myself and luggage occupied one hut, while the other, and some huts newly erected on this occasion, were occupied by my natives; fires were soon made, provisions cooked, and we ate and retired to rest, all being very tired. Not so, however, the females, who had a hut to themselves, for they kept up an incessant talking long after the men had retired to rest. I did not sleep well, so at daylight rose and hastened our departure. On resuming our journey we still continued to ascend until we attained the summit of the mountain, at an elevation of 3,600 feet, where we found huts similar to those seen yesterday, to which some of my men had made their way on the previous evening. One of them had charge of my provisions, which I was glad to obtain, as I had been compelled the previous night to share those of the natives. We halted at this place for breakfast. It was at this place that I first beheld that beautiful bird, the Superb Bird of Paradise (Lophorina atra), which was pointed out to me by one of the natives, but I did not succeed in procuring it. From this place, in a westerly direction, we could distinguish Atam, but we were still separated from it by a deep valley. To the north and north-west there was an extensive country, which appeared to me a thick, wooded plain, varied by low hills. To the south lay lofty mountains, which I considered were near Mount Arfak, which is marked in the charts as situated in latitude 1° 4′ south, and longitude 134° 2′ east, and as being 9300 feet high. From this place I could not see Mount Arfak; it may have been visible, but I was unable to recognise it, but I believed the range of mountains on which we were belonged to Mount Arfak. At the east we could obtain no view, as the dense forests of noble trees were close to us, and impeded the prospect. Continuing our descent we found the road at first good, but we gradually began to experience difficulties as great as in the ascent, and I could not avoid having frequent falls. I envied my native companions, who walked slowly but surely, their feet having such muscular power as to render them as useful as hands, and by the assistance of the great toe, acting similarly to the thumb of the hand, they are enabled to lay hold of any object, such as the root of a tree or a stone in the ground, by which means they are able to help themselves safely over the rough path.[*] By 10 a.m. we had descended from 3600 to 2700 feet, and then arrived at the bed of a large river, containing more water than the others we had passed, and I considered it might be the source of a large river which flows into Geelvink's Bay, and this opinion was afterwards confirmed by the natives, who named it Prafi. It is situated in latitude 0° 42′ south, and longitude 133° 40′ east. We stopped for about half an hour at the foot of the mountain which we had just descended, near a waterfall of about 100 feet in height; it was not one continuous fall, but was broken into several cascades as it descended. The source of this cascade was almost at the summit of the mountain, and the total length of the fall might be estimated at not less than from 500 to 600 feet before it terminated in the stream. After ascending along the course of the stream for two or three miles, we again took the track that led to Atam, which, like the other pathways, was very rough. The forest we passed through was gloomy, but very rich in vegetation, and the eye was relieved by a plant, apparently a Bignonia, bearing bright red flowers, which was afterwards considered by Dr. Beccari to be new;* but what most attracted my attention was the magnificent tree-ferns, which were abundant, of large size, and of a deep green colour; everywhere the forest was well watered by small brooks of excellent clear water. Soon after noon we were overtaken by rain, which rendered the pathways very slippery; and about 3 p.m. we arrived at one of the first houses of Atam, which was inhabited by two families; we remained here, as we were all very fatigued by our journey. I inquired for the Corano, or chief of Atam, and was informed that he resided higher up the mountains; two of the natives offered to go and fetch him. The next day I thought I should be able to go myself, but my men refused, saying that they were now at Atam according to our agreement, and my barometer this time told me they were right; we were now at an elevation of 3500 feet. During the time I waited for the Corano, I rambled about in the vicinity of the habitation, and the result of my excursion was a fine young specimen of that rare and elegant six-shafted Bird of Paradise (Parotia sexpennis). Wallace says of it:—

---

[*] This reminds me of the song of the Wollondilly (Australian) natives, as given in Mitchell's Expeditions to Eastern Australia, as follows:—

"Morrudá, yerrabà, tundy kin arra,
Morrudá, yerrabà, min yin guiny wite mà tà."

Meaning—

"On road the white man walks with creaking shoes;
He cannot walk up trees, nor his *feet-fingers* use."—G. BENNETT, M.D.

> "The Golden or six-shafted Paradise Bird is another rare species, and never yet obtained in perfect condition. This wonderful bird is about the size of the female Paradisea rubra. Over the forehead is a large patch of pure white feathers, which shines like satin; and from the sides of the head spring the six wonderful feathers from which the bird receives its name. These are slender wires, six inches long, with a small oval web at the extremity. In addition to these ornaments, there is also an immense tuft of soft feathers on each side of the breast, which, when elevated, must entirely hide the wings, and give the bird the appearance of being double its real bulk. The bill is black, short, and rather compressed. This singular and brilliant bird inhabits the same region as the superb Bird of Paradise, and nothing whatever is known about it but what we can derive from an examination of the skins preserved by the natives of New Guinea."—*Malay Archipelago*, Vol. II., p. 418.

Imagine my delight at obtaining this rare bird, for the first time, in a perfect state, most of the birds in collections being in a mutilated condition; this and others afterwards procured enabled me to make my observations respecting them in their natural haunts. These birds are found to the north of New Guinea, about thirty miles from the coast, and about 3600 feet above the level of the sea, near Mount Arfak. I never found the male in company with females or young birds, but always in the densest parts of the forest; the females and young male birds I have found generally in a much lower zone. Respecting its habits, I found it a very noisy bird, uttering a sound like "gnaad, gnaad." It feeds upon various kinds of fruit, more especially on a species of fig, which is very abundant on the mountain ranges; at other times I have observed it feeding on a small kind of wild nutmeg. To clean its rich plumage, this bird, where the ground is dry, is in the habit of scraping, like a gallinaceous bird, a round place clear of all grass and leaves, and rolls over and over again in the dust produced by the clearing, crying out at the same time, elevating and depressing its plumage, raising the brilliant silvery crest on the upper part of the head, and also the six remarkable plumes from which it derives the specific name of sexpennis; to see it at this time in its eccentric movements, and hear its cries, one would consider it was engaged in a fight with some imaginary enemy. This bird is called Coran-a by the natives. The eyes are of a light blue colour, with a circle externally of a pale yellowish green. The evening came and the Corano had not arrived. On the following day (the 9th) I was fortunate in obtaining specimens of those rare birds, the Parotia sexpennis, just described, and the superb Bird of Paradise (Lophorina atra), both beautiful specimens; the latter bird, like the former, is but little known, except from mutilated specimens. It is found on the same mountains as the Parotia sexpennis, and feeds upon similar fruits; it flies about from branch to branch among the trees in the forest, uttering a cry of "nied-nied," and from this peculiar note is named by the natives "Niedda." If the muscles used in the elevation of the crest and plumes in the Parotia sexpennis excite surprise, they are surpassed by those of this bird, for by the aid of its muscular apparatus, it can extend or contract, elevate or depress, the long velvet-like feathers that, commencing a little below the occiput, extend along the body like a mantle; and when this is elevated the two feathery tufts at the root of the beak are raised at the same time. Wallace says of this bird: "It is one of the rarest and most brilliant of the whole group, being only known from mutilated native skins. This wonderful little bird inhabits the interior of the northern peninsula of New Guinea only. We are quite ignorant of the habits of this bird, and also of the female."*

---

* Dr. Beccari discovered at Mount Arfak several interesting trees and plants, all suggesting a very interesting flora. Among them was an Araucaria, no doubt one of the Alpine species, a species of Vaccinium or Whortle Berry, a Rhododendron, a Podocarpus, a Drimys, one of the Magnoliaceæ and allied to the Winter's Bark, Umbelliferæ and one of those singular leafless parasitical plants, the Balanophora, found growing at the roots of trees. One species is found in Australia, and I found another at Erromanga, one of the New Hebrides group. They have generally very bright colours.—G. BENNETT, M.D.

The beauty of these birds, their velvet and metallic plumage reflecting brilliant colours, and the vivacity of their movements, were so remarkable that I felt regret at shooting them. I had these birds after they had been skinned roasted for my dinner, and found them of most excellent flavour; my meal however was interrupted by the visit of the Corana and his suite. Hearing a noise at the entrance, I turned and saw a number of men fully armed, who entered, defiled before me, laid down their arms, and arranged themselves about the room; they regarded me with great curiosity; there were about twenty in number. They were all decorated with necklaces and bracelets formed of shells, such as the Luesa, Brée, and Ztigau before mentioned, and a quantity of flowers of bright and rich colours adorned their hair, ears, and arms; the house was soon filled with them. Although this was not the first time I had seen such an assemblage of Papuans, still I was at first taken very much by surprise. After the men had entered, they were followed soon after by the women and children; but my surprise was still greater when I saw the Corano enter, armed like the others, and lavishly adorned with flowers; he was followed by his son, a youth about 25 years of age, and a daughter about 20 years old, both albinos; their hair was of a clear white colour, eyes blue, and skin white. In their simple and primitive costume, they reminded me of the representations of Adam and Eve, and I was able to form some idea of what our first parents may have been. The Corano was a tall powerful man, with a severe expression of countenance, and recalled to my recollection the description of the Roman Emperors. I paid my respects to him, and then invited him and his albino family to partake of my humble fare, which was laid out on the floor, as a table did not as yet form the furniture of my apartment; he accepted the invitation, and we soon became excellent friends. I presented amongst the whole of them a cup of Cognac brandy, but the Corano appropriated it to his own august person and drank it all at once. The albinos did not drink brandy, and as I possessed only one bottle I could not be very generous with it; and politeness to women is not a Papuan custom. By aid of the interpreter, I ascertained that the Corano welcomed me to his territory, and made me a present of yams, cobs of maize, and two or three dozen of Mandarin oranges that his daughter had brought with her. Are these oranges indigenous or introduced? If the latter, at what time? for the Dutch missionaries do not know, and the fact that the fruit has been seen on the mountains of Atam, and not on the plains, renders it more probable that it is indigenous; other kinds of oranges as well as Pamplemoses have been introduced at Dorey, and grow very well, but not the Mandarin variety. There is an indigenous citron growing on the plains near the sea, which bears a very large fruit. The Corano also made me a present of a roll of tobacco; the plant is extensively cultivated at Atam; it is of good quality, but unfortunately they cut it too green. He mentioned my having expressed a desire of visiting his house, and appeared gratified at the proposal. The remainder of the day passed rapidly away in conversation between us, which on my part was to obtain all the information I could from him respecting the birds and mammals of the country, and on other subjects of interest. The next day (10th) I received numerous visits from natives from the mountain, and as I had found that the whole of this locality was rich in ornithology and other branches of natural history, I considered it would be better to defer for the present my visit to the Corano, and first explore the whole of this place. Near the house where I resided there was a small house not quite finished, which I could rent for four metres of blue calico, and four brass bracelets. I took possession of it on the 11th, and displayed the Italian flag on a staff over the house; it was the first European flag that had been displayed in the interior of this almost unknown country. With some bark I divided my house into two rooms, one occupied as a sleeping room and workshop for skinning and preparing specimens of natural history; the other served as a reception room and also as a kitchen. A sheet of bark formed a table, and also shelves for my birds and other articles; my bed was arranged after the Papuan custom upon the floor of the room; and thus my habitation was complete. My sleeping room and workshop was closed by a piece of bark, so that I could work without interruption; for when the news had been circulated that a white man had arrived, the visits of the Papuans were very frequent. They usually brought yams, maize, and tobacco, for which I generally paid for with Mani-mani or Venetian beads, which are used as money; but having only a small quantity of these beads, I was compelled to economise them in my purchases, using them principally in payment for insects or animals collected for me by the women and children. But that which particularly occupied my attention at the present time was the renewal of my stock of provisions, as those I had brought from Andai were rapidly diminishing, and would not last many days longer. I spoke to the Corano about it, but he only put difficulties in my way. I offered to pay men to go to Andai for this purpose, but I could only obtain the promise from him that he was about to depart for his house to-morrow, and on his return would speak to me on the subject. He did not leave on the following day as he stated, but during the night there was a great noise in my former residence, which prevented me from obtaining any sleep. On the morning of the 13th the natives all took their departure, but before leaving they each took a string of grass, upon which they made ten knots. I asked them what it was for, in reply they informed me that the Corano and other chiefs had arranged for a head-hunting expedition, and that the time fixed was in ten days, and that the knots on the grass was to enable them to remember the time, and not fail to attend. I did not express any surprise at this event, and thought still less about it. However I was desirous of seeing the natives armed and equipped for a war expedition, but I did not expect much result, as I already knew that the natives were great boasters, but in the end performed very little. On the same day the men that I brought with me from Andai left for that place, and I availed myself of the opportunity of writing to Dr. Beccari to endeavour to send me the provisions I required. From the 14th to the 19th of September nothing occurred worth relating. During the time I was fully occupied in enriching my collections of birds and insects, the pursuit and collecting of which I found exceedingly interesting. I again tried to procure some men to go to Andai for me, but without success. On the 20th I had still some rice, but only sufficient for two days. My salt was finished. Since the 18th I had reduced the daily ration of rice to half the usual quantity, but I managed very well to subsist on yams, and the birds and other animals that I shot, so that I had often a novel and very excellent meal of roasted Birds of Paradise, of the rarest kinds, the beautiful and brilliant skins of which I had previously prepared for my collection. The water was so good that it did not require brandy to qualify it for drinking, but the want of salt I felt very much. I had sufficient powder and shot to procure birds for my collection, but not to supply myself with food. In spite [illegible]eat interest I took in the acquisition of rare and beautiful [illegible]l and other specimens, it did not prevent my feeling my privations. In the course of the day some natives arrived, who reported that the natives of Andai had killed a man belonging to Dorey, who was in company at the time with some men belonging to Soboe; the Arfaks had one of their people wounded. One of the arrivals told me that Dr. Beccari had directed him to desire me to return at once to Andai, but as he had no letter from him I paid no attention to it, but from that time I noticed there was a marked change in the friendly conduct of the inhabitants of this little village towards me. That evening, and many times during the night, I heard cries and lamentations. On enquiring the cause, I received a reply that they cried to the spirit of the man who had been killed, and to Setan (a word obtained from the Malays), the Spirit of Evil. It appears from this that the Arfaks, having no perceptible religion, or ideas of religion, neither idols, nor form of worship of any kind, are naturally very superstitious, believing to a certain degree in the existence of an evil spirit, whom they fear, They have also some idea of the immortality of the soul after death, and that the spirit of the dead is capable of inflicting injury. Something similar also occurred to me at Ramoi, another district in New Guinea. I suspect also that the evil spirit that they are desirous of driving away by their cries may even allude to myself. From the 21st to the 22nd nothing new occurred, but during the evenings, and occasionally during the night, the same cries and lamentations were renewed. On the 23rd the Corano arrived from Atam, with a large retinue, but he did not allude to or speak of the projected expedition; on the contrary, he was going to Andai to aid the Arfaks who lived there in the event of their being attacked by the natives of Dorey and Soboe. I again endeavoured to induce him to let me have some men to procure provisions, but without success. My friendly position with my neighbours was interrupted; neither women nor children brought me insects, and they soon refused to sell me yams and maize, which had become to me a necessary of life. During the day some men arrived, I believe from Andai, which I soon observed occasioned great excitement among the inhabitants. Soon after the Corano came and informed me by the interpreter that they were all in fear of being attacked by the natives of Soboe and of Morris, and intended to leave the village. The people of Soboe live near the sea, but those of Morris higher in the mountains than Atam. They added that before their departure they intended to destroy all the kobon, or plantations. He offered to give me men to carry my baggage if I would consent to leave with them. I did not believe what he said until I saw them commence destroying the plantations. My position became then very critical; having finished all my provisions except a little maize that I had purchased a few days before, I had only starvation before me if I remained. I had still fifty cartridges remaining, which if I used them in procuring game, would have left none for self defence in case of need. As for my interpreter David, he was more to be feared than trusted; I also considered that if the Arfaks left me I should lose all my collections from want of means of transporting them. I therefore, from the position in which I was placed, acceded to the offer of the Corano. I promised to leave with them if they would allow me to stay five days more at Atam, supply me with food, and furnish me with sufficient men to carry my baggage; in compensation for which I would make presents to the Corano, and also to the other chiefs. They all accepted my offer, and from the 23rd to the 25th everything passed quietly, but in the night the cries were repeated. For the first few days on arriving at Atam, seeing a very large fig tree in fruit, which a great number of various species of birds were in the habit of frequenting, and being unable from the great height, and thick branches of the tree to shoot any of them, I had a ladder made of lianas to enable me to mount the tree, by which I found little difficulty in ascending, and when I reached the first branches I could sit there very conveniently and wait for my victims. The tree was not far from the house. On the 26th, before sunrise, I was in the tree: it was a very fine morning, but cold, and no birds had yet arrived, except a solitary specimen of the rare and beautiful Paradise Oriole (Sericulus aureus), which I could not shoot, as the rapidity of his movements prevented me from taking proper aim, and it soon flew away. I regretted not being able to procure the bird, as it is so exceedingly rare that no perfect skins have been as yet procured by any traveller, the only specimens known to naturalists having been the mutilated skins obtained from the natives. While waiting in the tree for the arrival of the birds, I heard the noise of several voices shouting very loud. I could not understand the cause of such a noise, when suddenly I saw a young native under the tree, who by vehement signs made me understand that I was wanted at the house immediately. When descending from the tree, I lost a very valuable ring from my finger, which for eight years had been the companion of my travels. Arriving at the house I found them armed, and screaming out as if they were all mad; during the time they were screaming they shook their weapons, making hideous grimaces and contortions of the body. The women made as much noise as the men, and the *fracas* which was taking place was something diabolical. On inquiring the cause of this noise and excitement, David informed me that a great number of natives from Morris had come down from the mountains to hunt for heads among this tribe, and had surprised three very near the house, but they had escaped, seeing that the natives of Atam were prepared to defend themselves; but they were almost certain they would return in greater numbers. The Corano and his followers, finding they were not so numerous as the enemy, were alarmed and desirous of taking flight; many of the women and children had already left under the protection of some of the men, and those that remained were preparing to leave immediately. My reply was that I did not believe either in their promises or performances, and I was determined they should keep to their word, and stay with me five days; that I had no fear of them or the people of Morris, as I could at any time defend myself. I then left them, and entered into my house, which I closed as well as I could to prevent any of the natives from intruding. I considered it would be necessary to act upon their superstition, as force would be useless, and to succeed I went close to the fireplace to prepare six ball cartridges, to which I had added some melted grease and some powder that I took from my medicine chest; I also added a few drops of chlorodyne, of which I had a bottle with me. I did all this slowly and methodically without saying anything. David, who was present at the time, looked on all these proceedings with astonishment. I then loaded the gun and went into my bedroom. David, as I expected, left the house and went and related to the natives the proceedings he had seen, which I wished he should do. The consequence of this proceeding was that they thought I had poisoned the gun; their imagination, assisted by that of David, who was desirous of appearing better informed than the others, aided my plans much better than I had expected. The Papuans in general, and the Arfaks particularly, dreaded that the poison, as they supposed, by the smoke of my gun would be spread over the air, and thus have the power of destroying many people at once; to which were added several other fantastical ideas, all readily entertained by them. David came and informed me of all this, and asked me if it was true; so to make him and also the natives continue to believe in the delusion, I told him no, for a peculiarity of the native character is to believe in the reverse of what you say. A short time after this the village was very quiet. I then called upon the Corano and promised a great reward to any one who would find my ring. Many went to look for it, but did not succeed in recovering it. Several of the Arfaks, before they went to search the place where I said my ring had fallen, made a kind of incantation or cabal to find out where it was lost. It was conducted by them in the following manner:—They took some leaves of the pandanus tree, cut equally into small pieces, varying from two to three inches in length. The invocation consisted in placing the pieces all together, and forming with them different figures, which they changed from time to time, covering them with one hand, and uttering some words which I could not understand because they would not inform my interpreter. They afterwards placed all the pieces between both hands and blew upon them. Having completed the magical ceremony, they departed to look for the ring at the place that the cabal had directed them. After failing in their search they returned and resumed their magic ceremony, saying they had been deceived. They then renewed their search at another place, for it seems the responses of their oracle are not always the same; yet they are so convinced of the correctness of their cabal that they never doubt it, and now, finding that they could not succeed in recovering the lost article, they reproached themselves at not conducting the magic ceremony in a proper manner. It appears that the Arfaks always have recourse to this ceremony previous to deciding on any important affair. The 26th had been a very unfortunate day for me to record, for I had made no additions to my collections, obtained no provision, and a valuable and cherished ring had been lost. The 27th and 28th of September passed quietly, and I succeeded in making some addition to my collections, both of birds and insects, and also some specimens of the Cuscus, an animal peculiar to New Guinea and the Molucca Islands. I was also occupied in getting my baggage ready for my departure to-morrow. The natives in the morning had recommenced to make a noise, but a few firm remarks from me soon quieted them. Before sunrise of the 29th the natives were all ready to depart, and I was also prepared. I left with regret my house in which I had prepared and collected so valuable a series of zoological specimens, which compensated me by their novelty for the privations I underwent. By seven a.m. we started; without reckoning the little dogs, and the large and small pigs, many of which were carried in the nockin or net bag of the women, we formed a company of about forty persons.

---

* *Malay Archipelago*, Vol. II., page 406.

The Corano bore my flag and led the way; I followed him. The air of the mountain had so improved my health, that I found, although the Corano walked at a fast pace, that I could keep up well with him. At noon we halted for a meal, and a fire was lighted for the purpose of cooking some yams and cobs of maize, the only provision we had with us. The Corano, myself, and a few others, arrived first; David, who had my supplies with him, had not yet come up; but as I was hungry, I took some food from a nockin near me without asking permission of the owner. Later in the afternoon we arrived at the foot of Mount Putat, but the Corano persuaded me to walk in the rough bed of the watercourse, saying it would lessen the distance, to which proposal I acceded. We passed down the great and rugged bed of the watercourse, and then entered the level gloomy forest, and at last left it to mount some small hills. We had now travelled about three or four miles, when we changed our route. Soon after I heard the report of a gun in the direction of Putat. I immediately thought that Dr. Beccari or some men sent by him were on their way with supplies to me. I replied with two shots from my gun, but perhaps, from the direction of the wind, they were not heard, for I did not receive any reply. What could I do? It was evidently too late to return to Putat; on the other side my collection of birds, &c., many of which were still fresh and badly packed, were in want of care, so being already close to Andai, I considered it would be better to proceed, with the hope of soon returning. We walked until the fall of the night, and then stopped and arranged our bivouac. The natives lighted fires about, forming themselves into groups, everyone taking care of himself. At nightfall the fires were made to burn brighter, and the light from them brought out the men and trees around in fantastic forms. The reflection of the light of the fire upon the black skins of the natives, decorated with bracelets and necklaces of white shells, combined with the peculiar noise made by the roasting of the cobs of maize, had a curious effect; to this was added their voices when talking together, varied by their pleasing but rather mournful song. They all, however, appeared very happy, and seemed content with the sky for a roof, the ground for a bed, and simple fare to eat. My fire was made a short distance from the others, and during the time my supper was preparing I had the opportunity of observing the scene I have just described. After my supper I prepared the skins of two birds I had shot during the day, one a species of Cuckoo (Cuculus), and another a new species of Goatsucker (since named by Dr.

Sclater, (Œgotheles Albertisi). Gradually the talking and the singing of the natives diminished to a gentle murmur, and at last ceased altogether; the flaming fires burnt down, and all around was dark, which enabled me to observe the bats, who were busily engaged in capturing musquitos above our heads, and the tranquillity of the forest enabled me to hear the noise of the large fruit-eating bats (pteropus), with their huge leathery wings. The night being very quiet, the voices of the night-birds could be heard very distinctly far away, and would be answered by others from trees not far distant from me. Here and there some sparks among the ashes showed that the fires were not quite extinguished, and the snoring of the men indicated they were sleeping soundly. Some of them were placed as sentinels near our bivouac. On the 1st of October 1 arrived at Andai, and found that Dr. Beccari had gone. Could it have been the malice of the Corano in taking another road, or my ill luck which prevented me meeting him? Either way it was a subject of deep regret to me; because, if I had met with Dr. Beccari and obtained the supplies I required, I could have gone in any direction I pleased, without being dependent upon the Corano and his followers. Although my stay in the mountains did not extend over a great length of time, I nevertheless succeeded in shooting and preparing the skins of one hundred and twenty-two birds, many of which were very rare, and only known in Europe by mutilated skins carelessly prepared by the natives for ornamental, not scientific purposes; others were quite new to ornithologists. Among others I may mention a new Bird of Paradise, of which I only secured a pair, male and female, and they are unique specimens. It is evidently a very rare bird, for many of the natives did not know it, but others named it Quama. It was transmitted to the Zoological Society of London, and found to be a new Paradise bird belonging to the Epimachine section of the group, which Mr. Sclater named Drepanornis Albertisi. The peculiarity of the bird consists in the formation of the bill, the head, and the softness of the plumage. At first it does not appear to have the beauty usually seen among the birds of this class, but more closely observed, and under a strong light, the plumage is seen to be both rich and brilliant. The food of the bird is not yet known, nothing having been found in the stomachs of those I prepared but clear water. They are found in the vicinity of Mount Arfak. It is well to mention that, at nearly thirty miles from the sea coast, and at an elevation of 3,600 feet, among sixty species of birds, at least fifty of them are confined to that region, as

I have not found them anywhere else during my stay in New Guinea.* Among my collection of insects there are a number new, and I found some very fine specimens of Cetonia, and Melolontha. Mammalia are comparatively rare, for in all the parts of New Guinea at present known there are only three species of Cuscus, a Perameles, Papuan Wild Hog (Sus Papuensis), two or three species of Dendrolagus or Tree Kangaroo, a fruit-eating Bat, an animal resembling a striped Phalanger (Dactylopsila trivergata), a species of squirrel, two or three species of mice, and no bats from New Guinea having yet been described, there is probably six or seven new species in my collection. Among the Birds of Paradise I found the following:—Epimachus magnificus, Parotia sexpennis, Lophorina atra, Paradisia Papua—this species is rarer on the mountains than on the plains,—Diphyllodes speciosa, Sericulus aureus, and the new Drepanornis Albertisi. Vegetation is very luxuriant here, but the Arfaks only cultivate yams, maize, tobacco, sugar cane, and a few bananas. The climate is very mild, but humid, the rains being frequent, as well as dense fogs. The natives of Arfak, who were very much dreaded when Mr. Wallace was at Dorey, have now, by their intercourse with the Dutch missionary and others at Andai, become civilized. The Arfaks have in reality no form of worship or religion of any kind. They have no idols, like the natives of Dorey and Mansinam; but, like all ignorant people, are very superstitious, believing in and fearing an evil spirit, though knowing nothing of a benevolent deity, and trusting only in their personal strength. They, however, in their way, believe in the immortality of the soul, considering that after death the spirit of the dead roams about the forest. They bury the dead very near their houses, placing on the grave the weapons of the deceased, and for a time, varying from one to two months, they renew on the grave every other day a supply of provision and some tobacco. Afterwards they abandon the house, destroy the plantations, and construct another house and form other plantations higher up the mountains. These natives are generally very quiet in their manners, and are very kind to each other; their moral conduct is very strict; the smallest children capable of walking wear always as much clothing as the adult, scanty as this is, and both men and women display great affection towards their children. The women work as well as the men. In general they are more industrious in their habits than the natives of the plains and the adjoining islands; they are probably more compelled to labour, as their food consists of vegetables, which they are obliged to cultivate, though they also eat certain tree ferns which grow wild. They also use large snakes as food. Many families inhabit the same house, which is usually of a very large size, the females occupying the left, and the men the right side. Every family has its own fire-place, where they may be seen squatting down most of the day when not at work. There is a kind of platform above, where they generally sleep during the night. The women do not take their meals with the men. Near the large house there is a small house erected solely for the use of the women during childbirth, and here they receive all the necessary attentions and presents from their friends, but in this house no men are allowed to enter. Polygamy exists among them, but a wife costs so much in the purchase, and is so expensive an article, that a man seldom has more than one wife. The villages in the mountains are very numerous, but in each there is but a small population. The language in each varies, sometimes so much that the natives in one village do not understand the dialect of any other. Among the various tribes a great variation of type is observed, and it is seldom that one tribe intermarries with another. The natives of the mountains appear to have exceedingly good health and they are rarely afflicted by any but cutaneous diseases, more especially of a kind which is very prevalent among the natives of the plains, and named by them Cascado. It appears also that they attain a good old age; one man I saw was said to be seventy years old. Epidemics are occasionally known among them, as I perceived some of them marked by a small pox indigenous to the country.* After these remarks it may be asked why there is not a greater increase of the population. One day I made enquiry on this subject of the Dutch missionary, who mentioned to me (speaking only of the natives of Andai, although what he relates of them may also apply to those of Arfak), that they being adverse to having large families, abortion is prevalent among them, and from this cause mortality among the women is very great. During four years thirty women died at Andai, and only one man, and he was accidentally poisoned when I was there.

---

* I have just received parts 1st and 2nd of the Birds of New Guinea, by John Gould, Esq., F.R.S., in which many of the new Birds of Paradise and other birds collected by M. D'Albertis, including the new Drepanornis Albertisi, are magnificently delineated. —G. Bennett, M.D.

---

* There is an eruptive disease of a similar character, which is known to have prevailed among the Australian natives at Wellington, in New South Wales, and elsewhere, and named by them Thunna thunna, and by the colonists "Native Pock." It bears a close resemblance to the eruptive disease known as "Swine Pock" in Europe. In 1831 a Commission of Enquiry was appointed by the Government of New South Wales, and an account of the Report of this Commission was published in my "Wanderings in New South Wales," Vol. 1, p. 148.—GEORGE BENNETT, M.D.

L. M. D'ALBERTIS.

Translated and edited by GEORGE BENNETT, M.D., F.L.S., &c.

A TWENTY-FIVE YEARS' RETROSPECT.

THERE are few subjects of reflection more interesting to an individual or on which he may meditate with greater advantage than the incidents which make up the history of his past life, and so may it be said of the aggregate of individuals which constitutes a state. There are epochs in the life of the one and the other at which a recall of the past is fraught with special interest, and the present time forms such an epoch in the history of Victoria.

The day of publication of our present number is the twenty-fifth anniversary of Victoria's birth. On this day, a quarter of a century since, the proclamation went forth that the separation of the district of Port Phillip from the colony of New South Wales, so long desired and struggled for, had been accomplished. Thenceforth it was to be a colony bearing the name of our beloved Queen. Its "superintendent" was created its "governor," and it was to be "governed" in accordance with a "constitution" embodied in an Imperial Act passed the year preceding. The prophesies uttered that day as to its future prosperity might have appeared, to the sober-minded, wondrous flights of fancy, but had these been of much fuller promise, they would have been speedily fulfilled; yet truth to say we had then but little to boast of. Our population, less than 80,000, was running away to the colony from which we had just been separated, attracted by the gold which had just been brought to light there, and which we were vainly seeking for within our own territory. Our roads were mere bush tracks. The only steam vessel that occasionally entered the Heads was the Sydney steamer "Shamrock," from which we received a monthly visit. Our imports and exports were abundantly accommodated on the two or three hundred feet of ricketty staging on the Yarra bank known as "the wharf." And as for our "Constitution," of which we were then so proud, it would have tasked to the utmost the vituperative powers of the most voluble orator among national reformers adequately to denounce it. We were to be legislated for by thirty men, of whom ten were to be nominated by the Crown, and the remainder, possessing a substantial property qualification, were to be elected by freeholders, householders, and leaseholders only. Each Parliament was to continue for five years, unless dissolved in the meantime by the Governor; and the Ministry of the day could always be sure of seats in it as non-elective members; while it was prohibited from "passing any law that should interfere in any manner with the sale or appropriation of the land belonging to the Crown or with the revenue thence accruing."

Long before the issue of the writs for our first general election, most of the candidates had issued their addresses. Among these candidates was the late John Pascoe Fawkner, who claimed to be the founder of the colony, and whose possible election was regarded with dismay by some ultra-conservatives who declared they should regard it as tantamount to a break down of the "Constitution" at its first trial. The objection urged against him was his bluntness of speech and manner and his tendency to criticise somewhat roughly the conduct of persons in high places. He was elected notwithstanding, and although at times exceedingly personal and offensive in his Parliamentary deliverances, and accustomed to answer cries of "chair, chair," by counter exclamation of "stool, stool," an honester politician never sat in Parliament or one whose natural shrewdness, innate sense of justice and fearless persistence in what he regarded as his duty, did better service to his country. He died a member of the Legislative Council, where he was a staunch supporter of its privileges and a fearless asserter of its powers.

The texts of the various election addresses differed but little. There were then no "burning" questions save that of transportation, which a league had been formed to put a stop to, and of which every candidate was a supporter. All declared themselves in favour of immigration, the construction of roads and bridges, and the diffusion of education. Some were desirous of reducing the duration of Parliament from five to three years. The ballot was a principle then much discussed, and the majority of the candidates declared themselves opposed to it*. The electoral divisions, as settled by the Sydney Legislature, were by some candidates pronounced unsatisfactory, and they pledged themselves to endeavour to get them amended. The control of the Crown lands was put forward by others as an object to be attained, while one candidate, who was a part proprietor of the *Argus*, denounced the nominee element in the Legislature and expressed his determination to get rid of it as quickly as possible and procure the establishment of two entirely elective chambers.

---

* Among its declared opponents was William Nicholson, then Mayor of Melbourne, who was one of the unsuccessful candidates for the city at our first election. He afterwards, as member for North Bourke, introduced and carried a motion for its introduction, thereby earning for himself the title of "the father of the ballot."

On the 11th of November, 1851, our first Parliament was opened in the building in Bourke-street, then and now known as St. Patrick's Hall. The appearance of the House on the occasion can be better understood by an admirable sketch now in the Parliamentary library, than by any verbal description.*

The members of our first Parliament compare well with those who since its dissolution have entered the political arena. A large majority of them continued to occupy conspicuous and honourable positions in the colony, while they remained within it. Until very recently many of them were to be seen in both houses of the Legislature and at the present time they are to be found in the Legislative Council in the proportion of nearly one third. Four of our five Supreme Court Judges were members of our first Parliament, and some of the official members who returned to the mother country obtained and still hold there important public positions.

The condition of a country must of necessity be largely affected for good or evil by, and its progress in some directions be entirely dependent upon, the character of its legislation. However great may be its natural advantages, they can only be made productive of national progress by combined action. This must be subjected to laws enacted by representative men, and in proportion to the sagacity and virtue of these men will be the amount of national prosperity and of social and moral advancement. Hence the immense importance that is attached to the constitution of our representative system, and to the selection under it of suitable men for the performance of the work they have to execute. In tracing our progress for the last twenty-five years we shall not so much compare our present social condition with that which we were in at the time of separation (a comparison which the admirable compilation of the Registrar-General enables us to make for ourselves with microscopic minuteness), as endeavour to show how far the changes which have come upon us are traceable to, or have been affected by, the action of the Legislature, and it may be be as well before we enter upon this investigation to explain the alterations which have been made in our "constitution" since it was first bestowed upon us.

---

* This sketch was from the pencil of our then best colonial artist, Mr. Strutt, and was purchased by the Parliamentary Committee for £20. All the portraits were excellent, and time has not so changed those now living who figure in the scene as to prevent us from readily identifying them. Mr. Strutt went to England some years since, where he has exhibited some good pictures; one illustrative of "Black Thursday" we saw ten years ago, in the Crystal Palace Gallery, where it attracted much attention.

The Constitution Act gave the Legislature it created almost unlimited power to change or amend it. In little more than a year from the meeting of the first Parliament, within which time the population had increased three-fold, the number of members was increased from thirty to fifty-four. On the 1st September, 1853, the second day of the first meeting of the augmented Council, the Colonial Secretary invited it to consider the desirableness of changing the constitution by the creation of two Chambers, consisting entirely of elected members, and at his instance the whole question was referred to a Select Committee, which entered vigorously upon its work, and before Christmas brought up its report, with a "Bill" appended thereto, the first reading of which was moved by the Colonial Secretary in a speech in which he fully explained the nature of its provisions, and enlarged upon their probable effects, in order, as he stated, that during the Christmas recess, and before the second reading, they might be well understood by the outside public, and be subjected to public discussion and criticism. The Bill, contrary to the mover's anticipations, and as he stated in the second reading, somewhat to his disappointment, created but little stir in the community, from which he argued that it was generally acceptable, the only clause petitioned against being that increasing the State-Aid to Religion from £30,000 to £50,000 per annum. After a debate, which was spread over four sittings, the second reading was carried without a division, and was read a third time, after going through committee with little alteration beyond the reduction of the qualification of members of the Legislative Council from £10,000, or £1000 per annum, to half these amounts. By the 54th clause it was made lawful "for the Legislature of Victoria (subject to the provisions contained in the Act) to make laws for regulating the sale, letting, disposal, and occupation of the waste lands of the Crown within the colony, and of all mines and minerals therein," a provision which rendered it necessary to reserve the Bill for the approval of the Imperial Parliament, and it was not until July, 1855, that it passed the Act which gives our present Constitution Act the force of law. It was to come into operation at the expiration of one month from its proclamation in Victoria, which took place on the 23rd of November, 1855, but under its provisions the existing Legislative Council was empowered to legislate until the issuing of the first writs for the election of the members of the two Houses. The Council was not dissolved until the autumn of 1856, and in the interval between that date and the date of the proclamation it passed several very important and comprehensive measures, addressing itself, however, more particularly to the passing of an Electoral Act, and an Act to regulate proceedings at elections. During the passage of the Electoral Act through committee, provision was made for the taking the votes by ballot—a provision which, as we have stated in our note at page 281, was introduced by Mr. Nicholson, and agreed to, after a most animated and interesting debate, by a majority of fourteen, on a division in which 38 members voted.

The Parliament elected under the new Constitution Act met in November, 1856, and within little more than two years it abolished the property qualification required for members of the Assembly, gave to every natural born or naturalized subject of Great Britain, under certain very slight limitations, a right of voting, altered the electoral districts, increased the number of members from 60 to 78, and reduced the duration of Parliaments from five to three years. The principle of payment of members was advocated at a very early period, but it was not until the year 1861 that a Bill passed the Assembly to give effect to it. This Bill, like a number which passed the Assembly from time to time between that date and the year 1870, was also rejected by the Legislative Council, but it assented in that year to the Act for payment of members which is now in operation. The constitution of the Legislative Council has been very slightly altered. The property qualification of electors and members has been nominally reduced one-half, but as the amount of rating has been made the standard of value, which it is well known is in many cases much below the actual value, the extent of the required property qualification has in fact been very little diminished.

Having described the various changes which have taken place from time to time in our legislative body, we will now consider the general character and effect of the work which it has accomplished since it came into existence. The limited space at our disposal precludes us from giving even a synopsis of the more important measures of each session, and we must content ourselves with a review of the rise and progress of the more important measures now in operation, which were prompted by the pressing requirements of the population or originated in a desire to improve its social or moral condition.

Almost immediately upon the meeting of Parliament it had to deal with the difficulties created by the gold discovery, which far exceeded in importance that made a few months previously in the sister colony. Committees were appointed from time to time to enquire into and report on all those matters relating to gold-mining which legislation could deal with, and upon the reports of these committees and upon the results of experience were based those statutes by which our present gold-mining operations are now regulated. A mint was proposed at a very early period, and would have been erected many years before it came into existence, had not the Legislative Council rejected the first Bill which authorised its construction. Mining on private property was also at a very early period made the subject of Parliamentary inquiry, and the opinions of the committee and the evidence given on the subject might now well be considered in connection with the settlement of this important question as to which the two Houses have never yet been able to come to an agreement.*

The public roads are to a country what the veins and arteries are to the human body. At the time of separation there were not, we believe, twenty miles of road which did not under a wet sky and moderate traffic become impassable in a few hours. On the discovery of the gold-fields, Melbourne sent forth to them day by day its thousands with provisions for their support. The wet season came on, and the highways became useless and unoccupied, "and the travellers walked through by-ways." Then scenes were witnessed and sufferings encountered, the miseries of which it would be almost impossible to exaggerate; the pecuniary losses and the sacrifice of property were terrific. We knew a man who lost £5,000 in as many weeks, in endeavouring to send fifty tons of flour to Ballarat, of which there did not reach its destination enough to make a pudding. The expenditure by the Parliament on roads and bridges increased from £11,000 in 1851 to £520,000 in 1853, and in February of that year the making and improving the roads of the colony was provided for by an Act creating a central road board appointed by the Governor-in-Council, and of district elective road boards, invested with ample power for constructing roads, with money to be raised by tolls and assessments, supplemented by Government grants. This measure may be regarded as the initiation of local government. It was practically superseded by the Act passed in December, 1854, introduced by Captain (now Sir Andrew) Clarke, the then Surveyor-General, for the establishment of municipal institutions, and from this Act have sprung the various acts relating to boroughs and shires which are to be found in our Statute Book, and which are all now merged in the Local Government Act of 1874, containing 532 clauses, and forming a body of laws which amply provide for efficiently dealing by local representatives with almost all the public matters by which the health, material comfort, and social condition of a community resident within the various areas under their charge can be affected, guarded or promoted.

---

* The report of the committee is to be found in Notes and Proceedings 1856, vol. 2. Under the head of special cases it contained some very interesting information relative to the mining properties now known as "The Clunes," and "The Winter's Freehold."

The only parts of the colony which are not subject to the Local Government Act are the cities of Melbourne and Geelong. Long before separation these places had been incorporated by the New South Wales Legislature, and the civic authorities have ever since most zealously guarded their privileges and powers. Their exclusiveness, however, precluded them from getting the benefit of the special expenditure from the general revenue, which the condition of things induced by the sudden influx of a large population necessitated, and the cities of Melbourne and Geelong were literally in a slough of despond for want of funds. The streets of Melbourne in the years 1852-3 were at certain seasons in such a condition that nothing but the utmost necessity could induce us to traverse them—when we did so the ladies had to encase their delicate extremities in "Wellingtons," while the sterner sex had recourse to the use of "Napoleon" boots, and pedestrians of both sexes paraded the streets in "chaussures," distinguished respectively by the names of these world-renowned military rivals. At that time there was living amongst us a gentleman of the name of Gabrielli, who belonged to the class of persons who describe themselves as "financial agents," gentlemen who, although very skilful in bringing together those who want money and those who have money to spare are often in their own financial affairs sadly puzzled how to make "both ends meet." Mr. Gabrielli suggested to the corporations the borrowing of a large sum of money under Government guarantee, and he negotiated so skilfully that the Parliament undertook the repayments of £500,000 borrowed by Melbourne and of £200,000 by Geelong, by yearly instalments of £35,000 per annum, the corporation providing for the interest in the meantime out of their own rates. The loan scheme was successfully launched by Mr. Gabrielli, whose commission thereon was sufficiently large to give him a respectable competence. After spending a short time in the colony, he went home to enjoy it, and we hope he did so.

The initiation of our railways and of our water supply is traceable to private enterprise. The prodigious stream of population which rushed in upon us within a few months of our gold discoveries was accompanied by a proportionate importation of merchandise, for the transport of which from the Bay to Melbourne and its reception on arrival there, our lighterage power and wharf accommodation were altogether inadequate. The cost of lighterage went far beyond that of the freight from Europe, and the goods were thrown from the lighters on the muddy banks which went by the name of "the wharf," often to sink below it beyond recovery. This state of things led to the formation by private capital of the Hobson's Bay Railway, under an Act obtained in January 1853; and almost simultaneously companies were formed and Acts obtained for the construction of a railway to Geelong, and one to the River Murray. In all these Acts a power of purchase was reserved to the Crown, and to the two last companies a guarantee of five per cent. on their expended capital was guaranteed for a period of twenty-one years. The Legislature very quickly recognised the importance of keeping railway construction in the hands of the State. In June, 1854, a commission was appointed "to enquire into the best mode of providing for the internal communication of the colony, of which Sir Francis (then Dr.) Murphy, Chairman of the Central Road Board, Captain Pasley, and A. Ross, Esq., both eminent engineers, were the members—they examined a large number of witnesses, and in their report, made in September, 1874, they recommended the construction of National Railways at a cost of about £35,000 per mile, with money borrowed outside the colony. The report recommended further the purchasing of the existing railways and the merging them in the Government lines and also the immediate construction of the line to Sandhurst, the obtaining surveys and sections for lines from Melbourne to Castlemaine and Sandhurst; from Melbourne in the direction of Sydney, and from Geelong to Ballarat. In March 1855 a committee was appointed "to take into consideration the proper manner in which railways in the colony should be constructed and managed." In the May following it brought up a progress report, in which it discouraged the formation of railways by private companies, pointed out the evils resulting from permitting the construction of competing lines, and recommended the formation of a line to Castlemaine "with a view to its further extension to the Murray," and a direct line from Geelong to Ballarat, "with a view to its further extension to the westward." This committee was re-appointed the following session, and in March 1856 brought up its final report, in which it expressed unreservedly its opinion that the construction of our railways should be entrusted to the Government, and that money should be borrowed to defray the cost.

Notwithstanding the recommendation in the report of 1854, "that steps should be taken to annul any legally acquired rights which might prevent the Government dealing with the principal line of communication by the construction of railways," no attempt to purchase the rights of the shareholders of the Geelong Railway or Murray River Railway was made until after the lapse of a considerable period from its presentation. The Murray River Railway, better known as the Mount Alexander Railway, soon came to grief for lack of funds, and the few shareholders connected with it were only too glad to part with it to the Government, in the year 1856, at the price of £68,000, paid in five per cent. debentures. The Geelong Railway proprietary stuck to their property for a much longer period. The Geelongese had formed the most extravagant ideas as to the effect of the railway upon their city—the wildest enthusiasm was exhibited on the occasion of the cutting of the first turf, which was commemorated by a banquet, at which Dr. Thompson, the Geelong member, made that remarkable prophecy as to the future of Geelong which caused it thenceforth to be designated as "the pivot;" but when the line came to be opened, all these vaticinations were falsified. As ominous of its future, on the day of the opening the engineer of the line was killed within a few minutes of the departure of the first train, which was under his charge; disaster followed disaster, and the line was ultimately taken over by the Government to the great relief of the shareholders. The small line known as the Essendon line, constructed by private enterprise, was a complete failure, and was sold to the Government at an enormous sacrifice, and now forms portion of the North-Eastern line. The Melbourne and Hobson's Bay Railway, the levels of which were required by the Act of Corporation to be made so as to admit of its connection with the Mount Alexander Railway, is now the only line remaining in the hands of a private company, and will inevitably ere long be connected with the Gippsland line at its termination at Oakleigh, from which the Melbourne and Hobson's Bay line is distant little over four miles, the connecting link being very inexpensive of construction. The time within which the power given to the Government to purchase the Company's line has elapsed, and the most extraordinary and "bizarre" projects have been suggested by those interested in the formation of a new suburban line for getting from Melbourne to Oakleigh by what is euphoniously called an "outer circle" without using the Melbourne and Hobson's Bay line; but whatever may be the decision of Parliament on these projects, the ultimate connection of the Melbourne and Hobson's Bay line with the Gippsland Railway at Oakleigh is certain.

Our State waterworks originated in this wise:—Before the days of the gold the inhabitants of Melbourne were supplied with water conveyed to them by water carts, or stored in underground tanks; very few houses, however, at that time having these advantages. The carts were filled at a pumping establishment, the property of a "water company," which occupied the site of the wooden building now standing at the corner of Elizabeth and Flinders street. When the rush of population set in, this establishment was daily blocked with carts struggling for their loads, which were sold at prices that went on advancing until the cost of water seemed to be approaching the cost of milk. A water company was thereupon formed for the purpose of reticulating Melbourne with water pipes, and a longing eye was cast upon a large number of these pipes deposited on the then waste ground between the Falls and Sandridge, to which place they were destined to convey the Yarra water. The city corporation, however, claimed the right to carry out this undertaking, and we were among those who received a severe snubbing from the then Mayor of Melbourne for the audacity of our request that the Corporation would give us the pipes and allow us to take the water supply of Melbourne and Sandridge into our own hands. Nothing daunted, however, by the civic frowns, the company went to the Legislature, where it was so well received that the city magnates began to be alarmed as to the preservation of their unused privileges. They pleaded through their representatives in the Council, the necessity of caution, asserted that all they wanted was the framing of a well-considered scheme, referred to the different opinions that had been given on the subject by scientific men, and expressed their willingness to place the whole matter in the hands of the Government. To this the shareholders in the intended water company agreed; the result was a parliamentary inquiry and the ultimate adoption as a Government undertaking of the Yan Yean scheme, to carry out which a loan was raised of £800,000, secured by Government debentures, the issuing of which formed the commencement of our national debt.*

Notwithstanding the general approval of the recommendations of the Railway Committee made in the year 1856, it was not until the year 1858 that the Parliament could muster up sufficient courage to give effect to them. In that year it authorised the contracting a loan of eight millions for the construction of railways, and since then we have from time to time contracted additional loans which have brought up our national debt to about thirteen millions, of which upwards of eleven millions have been expended on railways, and the remainder on water supply, the Graving Dock, and public buildings. We do not include in the above sum the two millions and a half authorised to be raised by the last Loan Act, of which £1,400,000 is to be applied to railways, £600,000 to school buildings, and the remainder upon works for the supply of water.

The liberality of Parliament has been extended far beyond the supply of our merely material requirements. It has recognised fully the value of mental culture, and of the developement of our higher faculties, by the stimulating influences of the display of works of art and science. Our first Legislature brought into existence the Melbourne University and the Melbourne Library, Museum and National Gallery, the creation and support of which by grants from the public revenue have established for us an intellectual and æsthetic pre-eminence in the Southern Hemisphere which is everywhere acknowledged. The initiation of these institutions must be credited to Sir Redmond Barry, who succeeded in impressing Parliament with their importance. The first stone of each building was laid by Sir Charles Hotham on the 3rd of July, 1854, accompanied by a processional ceremonial designed by Sir Redmond, which was of impressive proportions but was sadly marred in its effect by the condition of the streets and the state of the weather. The University, the grounds of which comprise about fifty acres, was established under an Act passed in the year 1853, under which it has been endowed with an income of £9000 per annum, while the whole cost of the building and of the laying out of the grounds has been defrayed with grants made from time to time from the general revenue. It has received since its opening nearly 1000 students, and there belong to it nearly 400 graduates. The professors are men of European reputation, and the standards of the examinations are, it

* This loan was repayable by yearly instalments of £40,000, and the whole was paid off at the end of the year 1873.

is well known, as high as that of any university in any part of the world. The Public Library has been erected at a cost of £100,000, while the grants for books, pictures, and other works of art, since the opening in February, 1856, fall little short of a quarter of a million. In addition to our expenditure on these institutions, the Parliament has created by grants from the public revenue our beautiful public gardens, our parks, our Astronomical Observatory, and last, though certainly not least, our Government-house, which, contrasted with the unpretending residence at Jolimont of Governor Latrobe, and with the humble cottage of the first Colonial Secretary, Capt. Lonsdale, both of which are visible from its tower, may be taken as a symbol of the progress of the colony between the erection of the two last and of the first-named buildings.

On all subjects directly affecting the interests of the body politic and as to which legislation was seen to be needed, legislation of a practical character has been promptly applied. Our system of jurisprudence corresponds in theory and practice to that of England, and in the administration of justice we have adopted its principles, and given effect to the decisions of its courts, while we have grafted on our legislation from time to time during the last twenty-five years that of the mother country on almost every matter as to which we felt that such legislation might be advantageously applied. Beyond all this we have introduced and perfected a system of land transfer which will, we doubt not, be accepted ultimately as the model of legislation on this subject in every country in Europe.* We have passed valuable and comprehensive measures of a sanitary character, have established a system of public registration, which, carried out by our able Government statist, enables us to judge from year to year of our progress and bearings with as much accuracy as the progress and bearings of a ship at sea can be ascertained by the chart, the compass, and the sextant—and we may assert generally that no country in the world can produce a body of laws having a direct influence upon the daily business and requirements of life, or affecting directly our social condition, more efficient or comprehensive than those which are to be found among the 534 statutes which have been passed by our Legislature since we were entrusted with self-government.

---

* Mr. Torrens, of South Australia, a layman, was the originator of the system. He, by unwearied perseverance, got it embodied in legislation by the South Australian Parliament. Mr. Coppin introduced it to the Legislative Council, where it passed without difficulty, but it met with considerable opposition from the lawyers in the Legislative Assembly, where it was taken charge of by the Honorable J. Service. We remember attending a meeting in the Assembly Chamber, at which Mr. Torrens was subjected to a severe cross-examination on the merits of his scheme, in which he came off triumphant.

It is responsible however for enactments founded upon theories and transcendental ideas, as to the ultimate effects of which we confess to serious misgivings. Up to the year 1866 we were a free-trade country, and fast as was the progress of the neighbouring colonies, it could not keep pace with our own. In the year 1863 the cry was raised for "protection to native industry;" it had an attractive sound, and it was put forward on behalf of a class numerous enough to exercise a powerful influence upon the constitution of the Assembly, and who accepted without consideration or question the statements made as to the benefits they would derive from it. We pass over that terrible struggle between the two Houses to which the introduction of our first protectionist tariff gave rise, and which terminated in its acceptance by Parliament in April 1866, to be followed by one of a still more protectionist character adopted in the year 1871. The colony of New South Wales has established a free-trade policy. She is now gaining rapidly upon us, and, weighted as we are, we may expect that she will ere long shoot past us in the race. Such a result would not, we fear, be much cared for by those who believe that "protection" promotes their individual interests. "What matters it to us," they would say, "that the growth of Victoria as a whole becomes dwarfed and stunted under what you call the blight of protection, so long as we as individuals thrive and prosper by it?" It will not be until these persons feel that they themselves lose more from the "protection" given to other sections of the community than they gain by that which is conferred upon their own, that they will collectively give up their adherence to protective principles, and we fear that we must wait for this gradual progress of enlightenment for finding our way back to the free-trade path from which we deviated.

Endowed as a people with a magnificent country, which we were left free to deal with in such way as might seem best calculated to promote our national advancement, our land legislation has been a series of blunders of a disastrous character. Yet the policy intended to be carried out by our Land Act was an admirable one. Regarding the land as national property, it was felt that it would be more valuable to the country in the hands of a body of working men of small means, who would cultivate it for the benefit of themselves and families, than in the possession of a few wealthy individuals who would use it exclusively for pastoral purposes. It was therefore determined not to sell it to the capitalist, but to part with it to working men on terms which made it almost a gift to them, but subjected them to conditions, the imposing of which it was imagined would secure its cultivation and its retention in their hands. The Act however by which this was to be accomplished contained within itself the elements of failure. It stimulated the cupidity of all classes by the facilities it afforded for obtaining at a nominal price the choicest lands in the colony, while the conditions framed with the view of keeping them in the hands of a special class, and causing them to be applied to special purposes, were left dependent for their fulfilment on a national morality stronger and more self-denying than has ever been exhibited by the people of any country. These conditions, moreover, were made binding for a limited period only; and it might have been foreseen that at its expiration these lands would, under the resistless power of capital, be vacated by the class of persons it was the object of the Act to keep as their permanent occupants, and would pass into the hands of another class, who would promote the mischief the Act was passed to avert—"the laying field to field until there be no place left." It moreover disabled the men with small means, for whose benefit the Act was passed, from obtaining on the security of the land the capital required by them to turn it to good account, thus rendering it profitless both to them and to the State—such a dilemma being the natural consequence of the enforced severance of labour from capital, the union of which forms the mainspring of individual advancement and of general prosperity. There were other defects in the Act, but in none of its provisions was there shown a greater want of forethought than in those which enabled every selector to get the same quantity of land, without regard to its character or locality, a liberality equivalent to that of an individual who, possessed of a limited number of coins—gold, silver and copper—gave them away without reference to their intrinsic value—so many and no more—to each applicant, the right of selection being given to each recipient in the order of his application.

Bitter have been the denunciations by the Parliament, the Public, and the Press, of those who by fraud and evasion have made our Land Acts subservient to their own selfish purposes; but alas! their perversion can be charged against Parliament itself. The 42nd section of the Land Act 1869, authorising selections to the extent of twenty acres "on a goldfield or adjacent thereto," has by a grotesquely absurd theory been made applicable to land in any quantity and in any part of the colony, and under this construction of the section persons have become possessed in fee simple of lands, for which they paid only a nominal price, and which were no more connected with a goldfield than they were with the moon. This palpable "fraud upon the Act" was not only condoned, but applauded as a masterly piece of statesmanship by one branch of the Legislature, and this perversion of the Act, with the assent of the Assembly, on the ground of its supposed public advantage, has been urged by individuals as a justification of its evasion by them for their own benefit. The paltering, however, by Parliament with this section sinks into insignificance when compared with its disregard of the 38th section of the Land Act 1862, and which was in force until the coming into operation of the Land Act 1869, and under which there should have been appropriated every year to the purpose of assisted immigration one-fourth of the net moneys "received in each year from the sale or leasing of the lands of the colony." This provision has not been respected, and we believe that if an account were taken of all the sums received from the abovementioned sources between the years 1862 and 1869, and of sums expended between these periods for immigration purposes, there would be found claimable from the funds of the colony in aid of such purposes not far short of a million of money.

Before the Crown entrusted us with the control of our lands, one-half of the proceeds of the sale thereof was applied to immigration purposes; and the leading principle of our land legislation, initiated in 1862, was the permanent settlement upon the land of a working population to be attracted to our shores by the easy terms on which land would be granted to them. The settlement on the land it was urged by the advocates of the measure would, by the operation of the 38th section, go hand in hand with the introduction of streams of people who would become tillers of the soil and consumers of its products; but long before the passing of the Act of 1869, this section had been practically ignored. Under the influence of what are called "liberal" ideas, we have divided amongst ourselves the lands with which we were entrusted for the benefit of ourselves and our fellow countrymen at home; and the time will surely arrive when we of the present day will be as bitterly denounced by those who may come hither hereafter, as were the squatters by those who rushed the colony in the year 1852, and found these pastoral magnates claiming to hold pretty nearly the whole of the land in the country by virtue of privileges which, under the resistless power of public opinion, and the pressure of public requirements, they were ultimately obliged to abandon.*

On the Assembly alone devolved the duty of giving full effect to the section, the disregard of which we have pointed out and for which disregard it alone is responsible. If it be urged that the money claimable under it could be turned to a better purpose than the promotion of immigration, it should be freed from the existing charge upon it by a measure agreed to by both Houses. The Council assented to the Land Bill of 1862, believing that the provisions embodied in it would be respected.† And it is a fraud upon legislation by both Houses if measures mutually agreed upon are set at nought by the action or "inaction" of one House only. With reference to the general question of immigration, its value at the present time may probably be questioned by some long-headed politicians. They may urge that as we are adding yearly to our numbers a few thousand babies we can dispense with the introduction from without of able-bodied adults, or that we may trust to our climate and geographical position to attract hither those who have been enabled by less favoured colonies to join their population. However this may be, it is certain that we owe our greatness to the influx of population subsequent to the year 1851, and we do not think there are many who would be found to deny that the importance and wealth of a country of great national resources will always be proportionate to the numerical strength of its inhabitants.

Before parting with the subject of our land legislation we may express our belief that we may yet turn to good account the remnant of our estate, to accomplish which it is understood that new legislation will be proposed. Legislation, however, of the kind which has been foreshadowed will, we think, be calculated to prevent selection altogether, as land subject to such conditions as it has been suggested shall be attached to its tenure would be a burden rather than a benefit. The problem to be solved is the creation of a system under which the land itself may be selected on very easy terms by men with small capital, who, so long as it remain in their hands shall receive the whole benefit thereof, but who shall not be allowed to make it the subject of sale or transfer, unless the state participate in the profit upon the transaction. We think that the English copyhold tenure furnishes a clue to the solution of the problem but we cannot here enlarge upon its peculiarities.

---

* It would be impossible in this article to narrate the history of the controversy between the squatters and the public which raged so furiously in former days. It is to be found fully and faithfully set forth in a work published by the Hon. Wm. Campbell, M.L.C., called "The Crown Lands in Australia," copies of which are in the Parliamentary library.

† The Council has not been unmindful of its duty in this matter. This disregard by the Assembly of the 38th section the Council energetically protested against in the year 1866, and again in the year 1874.

There is another measure which was passed with general approbation a year or two since, but, Micaiah-like, we are unable to join the rest of the prophets in declaring of it "good only." The Public Instruction Act, like the Land Act, was passed upon transcendental principles, upon the assumption that what might be in itself desirable legislation could accomplish. Not satisfied with a system of public instruction under which, at an expenditure within our means, primary instruction had become more general in Victoria than in any other part of the world, we have, with the view of forcing instruction upon every child in the colony, established another system necessitating an expenditure the strain of which upon our annual income has been found greater than it could bear. The great design of the Act, which we believe to be impossible of accomplishment, is to be carried out by providing schools and teachers at the public expense, available to all free of cost, and into these schools are to be driven those children whose parents are so vicious or selfish as to allow them to grow up in brutish ignorance. Under this system it is expected that there will be such a general diffusion of knowledge and such a general enlightenment as will raise the rising generation and the generations yet to come to an intellectual elevation higher than has been attained by any people. The knowledge acquired in the State schools will doubtless become a great power, but its exercise for good or evil will be dependent upon the moral qualities with which it is associated. The teachers are by the Act so strictly prohibited from giving any other than secular instruction, that they would be infringing its provisions were they to refer to the ten commandments. The importance of religious teaching was not denied by the advocates of the Act, but they threw the responsibility of imparting it on the parents, and no doubt if all did their duty in this respect, the confining the teaching in schools to secular matters would not form just ground of complaint. But how many parents are there of those who attend the State schools who may be relied upon for performing satisfactorily this most solemn obligation; and among those who do so, how many will have to mourn the influence upon their offspring of association with impure and vicious companions, such as will certainly be found among the hundreds of children of both sexes who are brought together in the schools, for whose home training there is no guarantee, and for whom mental training by the State school teacher is rendered impossible? "Perfect equality," we were told by an enthusiastic admirer of the Act, was to be established among the young of all classes—a complete fusion of every grade of society—but he was somewhat puzzled by our enquiry as to the class of child he imagined would give the flavour to the mixture.

The Act, however, has not yet been applied to the object the attainment of which was urged as a justification for the enormous expenditure it necessitates, viz., the forcing into State schools those neglected and vicious children in whom is concentrated a moral poison worse than the germ of any physical disease; and when children of this type—the gutter children, as they are called—are forced into the State schools, their fate is sealed; the children of decent parents will be seen there no more, and those vast school houses which, swarming with happy, healthy looking and decently attired juveniles, now gladden our eyes, will echo to the footsteps of a few unhappy specimens of infant humanity of the worst form of degraded nature. But such a state of things we cannot bring ourselves to believe will ever be allowed to come to pass, and we shall find that the costly system of public instruction to which we have committed ourselves for the special purpose of dealing with these children is, so far as they are concerned, altogether unworkable. The industrial school or the reformatory will be the refuge of the "gutter" children, where they will be better off, so far as regards moral training, than the State school children. Or it may be that the State will set up what the State knocked down—the ragged schools—which before the present Act came into operation, had been established and were mainly supported by private benevolence.

The providing education free of cost to the children of all classes was one of those sensational pieces of "liberalism" which Victorian politicians of "advanced views" are so fond of proposing, captivating enough for the moment, but which lose their charm when the sentimental feeling which inspired them has evaporated, and we have to deal with their stern results. There is no more reason why we should pay for the instruction of the child of a well-to-do individual than why we should pay for its clothing. Punish him if he let his child go untaught as we would if he suffered his child to wander about naked, but don't let us set up State tailoring establishments, and teach him to regard himself as doing somewhat of a patriotic action in sending his children to get "suited" there at the public expense. This legislative "craze" has given rise to fiscal difficulties which Parliament has as yet been unable to deal with,* and have plunged us into an acrimonious contest as to "who shall pay the piper," the issue of which it is impossible to foresee.

We believe, however, that the independent spirit of the colonists will go far to modify the future cost of public instruction. Those who can afford to pay for their children's schooling will, as a rule, be led, after a time, to send them to schools where they can establish some social relationship with their teachers, and where they will be "looked after" by persons who will take an interest in the formation of their character.† They will withdraw their children from schools where the master has no moral influence, and from which he dare not expel any child, however vicious and contaminating. Schools will be established available for the middle classes, which will be well officered, well looked after, and will obtain the parents' confidence. These will be filled with children for whose instruction a charge will be made, moderate in itself, but quite sufficient to maintain the school in an efficient condition.

The rigid secularity of State schools will have to be relaxed, if they are to be made acceptable to the great bulk of the community. Religious instruction out of school hours will have to be encouraged rather than frowned upon, as it now is, by the secularists, who, without attempting to dispute their claim to be on a par in religious feeling with the various religious denominations, we charge as a sect with the most intense intolerance. The teachers should be permitted to enforce moral discipline by reference to divine injunctions; and a few well-selected quotations from holy writ, of a practical and undogmatic character, would, when exhibited on the walls, after having been approved by the Education department, speak silently to the heart of many a child and be remembered by him for good all the days of his life. We know that these suggestions will provoke the anger of many a secularist, but we believe the more they come to be considered the more generally will they find favor among the mass of the people.

---

* The admirable analysis of our public revenue and expenditure to be found in Mr. Jeffray's lately published address to the Chamber of Commerce, sets this in a light so clear that it must penetrate the cloudiest intellect.

† We may mention as schools of this description—All Saints' School, St. Kilda, and St. Paul's School, Melbourne. We believe there are several others of the same description.

In the retrospect of our past legislation we find on the whole much greater cause for congratulation than regret. We have made some failures but we have had great successes. We have incurred a national debt which, though somewhat large in its figures, is represented by national property returning an income even now almost equal to the interest we pay, and which will assuredly, as population increases, not only discharge the whole of it, but furnish most important assistance to our general revenue. Our state railways will not only yield hereafter a splendid income, but they will do more to promote general prosperity and bring our land into profitable occupation than could be effected by any Land Act, however well conceived and however perfect its provisions. Our system of local government is now thoroughly established under a body of laws so comprehensive and so wisely devised that the advancement of the country by representative institutions is made almost independent of the action of Parliament. The central government is relieved from the necessity of ascertaining and providing for the various local requirements of the people, as the colony is divided under the Local Government Act into a large number of districts which for almost all the purposes of government may be regarded as so many independent states, and which provide for themselves the funds required for their own advancement. These districts form moreover political schools in which we are training, throughout the length and breadth of the land, the men who will become hereafter legislators for the whole community. And these districts will act as examples the one to the other, "provoking each other to good works," and contributing by their collective, though independent action to the general prosperity. For the development of our intellectual power we have established schools of learning presided over by men imported from Europe, standing in the very highest ranks of science, who will leave their impress on the intellectual character of our posterity, as distinctly and clearly as the pure blood of the magnificent specimens of animal life which have been imported by our enterprising colonists will be traceable in the flocks which shall hereafter thrive upon our pastures. The elegance and refinements of life have not been overlooked by us, and we believe that, aided by our national institutions and under the influence of our genial skies, there will be hereafter developed here a race of poets, painters, and musicians equal to those who in sunny Italy have exercised their various arts to the delight of an admiring world.

We abstain from commenting upon our political characteristics for two reasons—our space will not admit of our doing so, and we feel that we are as yet too young a people to have formed well-considered and fixed political ideas. We have as yet gone little beyond the race which has been transplanted here—men, energetic, intellectual, enterprising—with generous instincts, and intense self-reliance. From such a stock we may hope to see produced a splendid people; but its permanent character awaits development in the adolesence of the children of the present generation. If it answer to the anticipations we are justified in forming of it, we shall have a race who will make Victoria as remarkable for mental and material wealth as it is celebrated for those fertile lands and those sunny skies which abundantly supply our animal necessities, and give a zest and energy to physical existence.

THOS. T. A'BECKETT.

CHINESE LITERATURE.

WHAT Victorian is not familiar with the tawny-faced, oblique-eyed, grinning Mongolian? Now he is moving with a swinging trot, his shoulder-pole bearing a weight that would make a white man groan; now he is chaffering on the door-step over his fish, his cabbages or his basket of wares. He is not redolent of the aroma of lettered culture. He does not look like the descendant of philosophers. And yet it is so. Ere Romulus had raised his Asylum, when Europe was still the haunt of primæval tribes, the ancestors of our friend had their cities and laws, their sciences and their schools. Sages were pondering subtle questions that have not yet been solved, and seeking in no mean way to lift man to the dignity of reason and conscience. China presents us with a unique developement. Her whole civilisation may be called indigenous, *i.e.*, it has become what it is, untouched by the light of a Divine Revelation and unmodified by contact with other peoples. Her corner of Asia constituted a sort of quarantine where internal tendencies evolved their full results. And the student of man finds his work much simplified by the exclusion of interfering elements.

We propose then, as far as a great subject will submit to compression, to review the classical literature of Ancient China. The translation which will be quoted is the "Chinese Classics," edited by Dr. Legge, Professor of Chinese Literature in Oxford. We shall thus be led briefly to review the early history, philosophy and poetry of the Old Empire.

I. The history of China was preserved up to his own day by Confucius (K'ung Foo-tsze, Latinized by the Jesuit missionaries), who was born 551 B.C. The Empire was then in the feudal state. From this stage it passed in 218 B.C., when the dynasty of T'sin overbore the other states. To eradicate the traditions of the subjugated kingdoms, the premier of T'sin proposed:—"That all the records in charge of the historiographers be burned; and that those who make mention of the past so as to blame the present be put to death along with their relatives, and that whosoever shall not have burned their books within thirty days of the issuing of the ordinance be branded and sent to labour for four years on the wall." The books vanished. But in eleven years the supremacy of T'sin ceased. Heaven had watched over the lost histories. The new Emperor was pulling down Confucius' house, when lutes and sounding stones, played by the usual *Deus ex machina*, led them to a recess where copies of the lost history were found. Others came in much in the same fashion. And all critics, both native and foreign, accept the recovered records as genuine copies of the sage's works. How far back then do these records, the *Shoo King*, as they are called, carry Chinese antiquity? Putting together the reigns of the sovereigns, we reach the date of 2356 B.C. Another history called the *Bamboo Books*, found in a tomb, gives 200 years less. The earliest date ascertainable with certainty is 775 B.C., beyond that we seem to have credible history up to 1121 B.C., but backwards to 2356 B.C. the records become inconsistent with each other, and the mythical element increases. We need not discuss their credibility, their inconsistency with the chronology of Ussher, nor their consistency with the Septuagint version of the Old Testament. From their own pages let us set up before us the China of that earliest date. We have the Emperor ruling over "the myriad states." Once in five years he makes a "tour of inspection" over the Empire; four times his nobles attend his court. They are fiefs of the throne. They receive "signets" or "sceptres" as badges of rank. The great affairs of state are managed by "departments" under the Premier or "Chief of the Four Mountains," "the General Regulator," "the Ministers of Instruction, Agriculture, Crime, and Public Works," along with the "Arranger of the Ancestral Temple," or Minister of Religion, and the "Director of Music." There are "statutory punishments." "Be compassionate in punishment," says the Emperor, and substitutes banishment for "branding, excision of the nose, and (in some cases) death." "The whip is to be employed in the magistrate's courts, the stick to be employed in schools, and money to be received for redeemable crimes."

Here is the minister's report of his action during a great inundation about 2200 B.C.:—

> "The inundating waters seemed to assail the heavens, and, in their vast extent, embraced the mountains and overtopped the hills, so that the people were bewildered and overwhelmed. I mounted my four conveyances, and all along the hills hewed down the woods, at the same time showing the multitudes how to get flesh and to eat. I also opened passages for the streams throughout the nine provinces, and conducted them to the sea. I deepened moreover the channels and canals and conducted them to the streams, at the same time sowing grain and showing the multitudes how to procure the food of toil in addition to flesh meat. I urged them further to exchange what they had for what [illegible] had not, and to dispose of their accumulated stores."

Agriculture is equally advanced. The fields throughout the Empire are divided into three classes, according to quality of soil, and proportionately taxed. They grow "various kinds of grain, flax, and hemp." They plant the mulberry and rear the silkworm, and produce "three sorts of silk." The Emperor on his tour "made uniform the standard measures of length and capacity and the steelyards." He assigns "chariots and robes" to those who serve him well. His army is disciplined, and equipped with shield, sword and spear, and celebrates triumphal processions, the soldiers decked with plumes.

Astronomy is as far advanced. The Emperor "regulates the calendar," announces that "the year consists roundly of 366 days," understands the necessity of an "intercalary month," gives instructions for determining the vernal equinox, and uses a "gem-adorned turning-sphere with a gem transverse tube to regulate the seven directors,"—probably an instrument for determining the position of the seven stars of Ursa Major. Music is largely cultivated; there are "odes in the palace and ballads among the people.'' "Poetry is the expression of earnest thought; singing is the prolonged utterance of that expression." They have eight kinds of musical instruments—"the lute, the flute, sounding stones, drums and hand-drums, pitch tubes and calabash organs." "Every three years there was a (civil service) examination of merits, and after three examinations the undeserving were degraded, and the deserving promoted."

The moral and political maxims of the time were such as these: "When a sovereign knows men he is wise and can put men into their proper places." The virtues of manhood are nine: "Affability combined with dignity; mildness with firmness; bluntness with respectfulness; aptness for government with reverence; docility with boldness; straightforwardness with gentleness; easiness with discrimination; vigour combined with sincerity; and valour with righteousness." The Emperor is complimented—"Rather than put to death an innocent person you will run the risk of irregularity." "It is virtue which moves Heaven." "Pride brings loss, and humility receives increase—this is the way of Heaven."

It would certainly be surprising could we regard such a height of civilization as belonging to China 2,000 B.C. But Biot in the *Journal Asiatique*, Cibot, Dr. Legge, and indeed almost all the best sinalogues have shown that this is more probably descriptive of China about 1,121 B.C., and is contemporaneous with Israel under the Judges, and Greece during the Trojan war. So much for history.

II. The Philosophical Literature of China now claims our attention. The word must include the ethical, religious, social and political cultus. For the sages were at once the priests, preachers, politicians and moralists of China. Confucius and his followers seem to have left untouched the physical sciences. They had no theory of the universe. They did not speculate on Theism nor investigate the laws of causation, nor deal with the immortality of the soul. Their philosophy thus shrank to moral science in its varied applications to the individual, society, and the State. Its great end was the right administration of the State. Its largest maxim was that the State was the macrocosm of which the family was the microcosm. What the father is, let the Emperor be. But how shall the father be what he ought? The answer goes to the core of Chinese philosophy—"Let him study personal culture."

This then is the key-note of the Confucian philosophy throughout the "Analects, or Digested Conversations," the "Great Learning," and the "Doctrine of the Mean." It pervades all the writings of Mencius, the great successor of Confucius, compacting itself in his pages ever and again into pithy sententious maxims, breaking into keen clear analysis and luminous exposition in a way far more attractive to a western mind than the prodigious vagueness of the Great Master Confucius. But the fact is, that to a European mind the clear well rounded maxims of the sages bear about the same proportion to their whole works as the raindrops do to the vast undefined outline of the cloud from which they fall. Let us take Mencius then as the Aaron, the expounder of this far Eastern Moses.

"The great object of Mencius," says his commentator Yang, "is to rectify men's heart, teaching them to preserve their heart and nourish their nature, and to recover their lost heart." Good and well, though somewhat vague. It suggests mostly the question "what do you mean by 'nourish their nature' and 'recover their lost heart?'" This leads us to the psychology of Mencius, where he first drops the sounding line of reason into the depths of consciousness and attempts the construction of a theory of human nature. And now at once we feel we are listening to a master thinker expounding man to himself. His theory of human nature stripped of its oriental guise is a striking analogue of Bishop Butler's in his famous sermons. The English prelate's main point is that "human nature is formed for virtue."

His synthesis of its component parts is that they constitute a hierarchy of grades subordinated one to another, all being ultimately under the law of conscience. The subordinate faculties he groups under the generic title "particular affections," implying that they seek each its own *particular* gratification, with a direct and special impetus, heedless alike of large self-love and moral consideration. And active virtue consists in the harmonization of all these under the sway of conscience.* Now Mencius gives us a luminous statement of the same doctrine of "particular affections:"—

> "For the mouth to desire sweet tastes, the eye to desire beautiful colours, the ear to desire pleasant sounds, the nose to desire fragrant odours, and the four limbs to desire ease and rest; these things are natural."

These represent Butler's "particular affections" unrelated to conscience. And now for their relation to conscience. "But," says Mencius:—

> "There is the appointment of Heaven in connection with them. The exercise of love between father and son, the observance of righteousness between sovereign and minister, the display of knowledge in recognizing the worthy, the fulfilling the heavenly course by the sages; these are the appointment of Heaven."

This certainly seems to recognise a higher law of the several powers than their own special gratification, the law of reason and right. Here is an exquisite piece of subtle analysis of feeling tending to the same view.

> "All men have a mind which cannot bear to see the sufferings of others. If men suddenly see a child about to fall into a well, they will, without exception, experience a feeling of alarm and distress. They will feel so, not as a ground on which they may gain the favour of the child's parents, nor as a ground on which they may seek the praise of their neighbours, nor from a dislike to the reputation of having been unmoved by such a thing. From this case we may perceive that the feeling of commiseration is essential to man, that the feeling of shame and dislike is essential to man, that the feeling of modesty and complaisance is essential to man, and that the feeling of approving and disapproving is essential to man. Men have these four principles just as they have their four limbs."

Here Mencius has severed himself from the school of selfish and of utilitarian philosophy, and joined the ranks of the intuitional moralists. It was no sense of profit that moved the man to rescue the child, the instinct of pity is as much a part of the man as an arm or a leg. All these "particular affections" then (whether of the senses or the feelings) are grouped by him under a most expressive phrase—"the passion nature." It answers to the "Active Powers" of the Scotch metaphysicians, and constitutes the motive force of human nature.

---

* It is singularly suggestive of speculation, that Mencius was propounding in the far East a Platonic type of philosophy at the very time that Plato, Aristotle, Zeno and Epicurus were illuminating Greece. So wonderfully do eras of thought synchronize.

> "This passion nature is exceedingly great and exceedingly strong. When nourished by rectitude and sustaining no injury, it fills up all between Heaven and earth."

Its perfect state would be an interpenetration of all its parts by conscience, for he says:—

> "The passion nature is the *mate* and *assistant of righteousness and reason.* Without it man is in a state of starvation. It is produced by the *accumulation* of righteous deeds; it is not to be obtained by incidental acts of righteousness."

Here then we have the mental forces marshalled and ready for action—what faculty shall lead?

> "The will is the leader of the passion nature. The passion nature pervades and animates the body. The will is first and chief, and the passion nature is subordinate to it. Therefore I say—maintain firm the will and do no violence to the passion nature."

His hearer cannot understand the possibility of maintaining firm the will "without doing violence to the passion nature." And Mencius replies:—"When it is the will alone which is active, it moves the passion nature, when it is the passion nature which alone is active, it moves the will." Our sage seems to say, though obscurely, the impulsive forces should not carry the will, the will should regulate them. Perhaps we are stating his doctrine more clearly than he grasped it himself, but he seems to be groping after this: that the force lies in the passion nature, that the highest state of the passion nature is its being "mated and assisted" by conscience, and that the will possesses a selective and directive supremacy in permitting the passion nature to act. If this be his view—and Dr. Legge so expounds it—then it is not only beautiful, but ideally correct. The portrait of the ideal man is true to the nail. But he does not clearly keep before him that it is true only of the ideal man. He attributes this ideal perfectness to all the sages. Nor has he at all appreciated the grave and serious inversion of this ideal constitution in the average man. For there is no postulate in moral science more certain than this—that man does not actually exhibit, that no man exhibits a perfect subordination of the active powers to the regulative principle. The scientific Darwinian who hlods that conscience in man is only in the nascent stage, coming to be the dominant ruler, and the theologian who believes that man has fallen from a state in which conscience possessed that supremacy—both alike feel, and feel keenly, that the actualism of man is seriously and sadly below the ideal. But the sage cannot get the real bearing of this. He will have it that the evil is only outside the man; or if it has got into him, it is in the *man* and not in human *nature*. Because good affections exist in human nature he will have it that the nature is good. He forgets the all-important fact that a *constitution* or *nature* is not *simply* good parts, but good parts in a *proper working combinatiŏn with each other.*

Here is a fine poetical exposition of his view:—

> "The trees of the New Mountain were once beautiful. Being situated on the borders of a large state, however, they were hewn down, and how could they retain their beauty? Still through the activity of the vegetative life, day and night, and the nourishing influence of the rain and dew, they were not without buds and sprouts springing forth; but then came the cattle and goats and browsed upon them. To these things is owing the bare and stripped appearance of the mountain, which when people see, they think it never was finely wooded. But is this the proper nature of the mountain? And so also of what properly belongs to man—shall it be said that the mind of any man was without benevolence and righteousness? The way in which a man loses his proper goodness of mind is like the way in which the trees are denuded by axes and bills. Hewn down day after day, can the mind retain its beauty? But there is a developement of its life day and night, and in the calm air of the morning, just between night and day, the mind feels in a degree the desires and aversions, which are proper to humanity, but the feeling is not strong, and it is fettered and destroyed by what takes place during the day. This fettering takes place day after day; the restorative influence of the night is not sufficient to preserve the proper goodness of the mind. And when this proves insufficient for that purpose, the nature becomes not much different from that of the irrational animals, which when people see they think that it never had those powers which I assert. But does this condition represent the feelings proper to humanity?"

This is beautiful. Its analysis is searching and its exposition full of poetry. But the only possible reply is that for a fact there never was a time in the individual's life, from cradle to grave, when his nature was full-foliaged and full-flowered with "the feelings proper to humanity." The hint of a divinely intended ideal, up to which the actualism of the present is ever aspiring in good men, is grand and wonderful for the man and time. But the sage is expounding himself, and that too in his best moods. For it is more than doubtful if "the restorative influence of the night" gives the average human being "the feelings proper to humanity to the degree," he asserts. And it is a very sad certainty that the "fettering" does not dissolve with "morning dews." The attractions of these things which gratify have a greater fascination for us, whether they be right or wrong, than Mencius would admit. Still ever and again he emerges from the confusion, and firmly asserts it is only of the ideal man he speaks. "From the feelings proper to our nature, we see that it is constituted for the practice of what is good. *This is what I mean in saying the nature is good.*"

His appreciation of the gradational value of our impulses and pleasures was keen, and its expression lucid:—

> "Those who follow that part of themselves which is great, are great men; those who follow that which is little, are little men. There is a nobility of Heaven and a nobility of man. Benevolence, righteousness, self-consecration, and fidelity with unwearied joy in what is good; these constitute the nobility of Heaven. To be a duke, a noble, a great officer; these constitute the nobility of man."

To say the least, this puts Paley to the blush when he says:—"I hold that the pleasures differ in nothing but in continuance and intensity"—a proposition which Mackintosh calls simply "brutish."

In an age when these subtle problems were so keenly discussed, it was inevitable that divergent schools should arise. Confucianism was assailed from two different sides, one philosopher Seuen controverting its fundamental tenet, "that man's nature is good;" and another advocating a gross Epicureanism, instead of its high toned morality. The actual phenomena of life present evil enough for a pessimist to advocate the psychology of Seuen, when he started to prove "that man's nature is evil."

Here is the opening paragraph of his treatise:—

> "The nature of man is evil, the good which it shows is factitious. There belongs to it, even at his birth, the love of gain; and as actions are in accordance with this, contentions and robberies grow up, and self-denial and yielding to others are not to be found. There belong to it envy and dislike, and as actions are in accordance with these, violence and injuries spring up, and self-devotedness and faith are not to be found. There belong to it the desires of the ears and the eyes, leading to the love of sound and beauty; and as actions are in accordance with these, lewdness and disorder spring up, and righteousness and propriety with their various orderly displays are not to be found.
>
> "It thus appears that the following man's nature and the yielding obedience to its feelings will assuredly conduct to contentions and robberies till the issue will be a state of savagism. There must be the influence of teachers and laws,

and the guidance of propriety and righteousness, from which will spring self-denial, a yielding to others and an observance of the well-ordered regulations of conduct."

We need hardly remark that, as far as Seuen was concerned, the remedial "influence of laws and teachers" was itself the product of the nature which he called evil. They were the offspring of the nature in which he could recognise no elements of goodness. With what wonderful straightness does the Christian apostle go to the core of the subject and cleave the gordian knot. In two sentences he accepts both views as a partially expressed truth and gives them a practical adjustment as a law of life. "I find then a law that when I would do good, evil is present with me." "I see another law in my members warring against the law of my mind and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members." But in the apostle we detect a poignant moral anguish, the seed of noble action, to which the sage was a total stranger: "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" And we find a kindling hope where Mencius had but a groping philosophy —"I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord." Looked at purely from the human side, it is this ability to create a piercing moral sorrow, at the failure to reach the ideal, and to supply a stimulus more keenly personal than mere words, which gives Christianity its superiority to all mere philosophies and moral systems. Christ is the Christian's ethical system flushed with the glow of life. The other school against which Mencius warred was a gross material Epicureanism. Almost at the very time when Epicurus was teaching that happiness was the great end of man's life, at the eastern extreme of Asia, a grosser type of his doctrine was being enunciated by Yang Choo. He blended in one the sourness of the Stoic with the morals of the baser Epicureans. His sentences have a ring of that bitter sarcastic disappointment which runs through so much of Ecclesiastes, unredeemed by the conclusion that winds up the preacher's words:—

"A hundred years," says Yang Choo," are the extreme limit of longevity, and not one man in a thousand enjoys such a period of life. Suppose the case of one who does so:—Infancy borne in arms, and doting old age will occupy nearly the half; what is forgotten in sleep and what is lost in the waking day will nearly occupy the half; pain, sickness, sorrow and bitterness, losses, anxieties and fears, will nearly occupy the half; but I reckon that not even in them will be found one hour of smiling self-abandonment without the shadow of solicitude. What is the life of man then to be made of? What pleasure is there in it? Being once born, take your life as it comes, and endure it, and, seeking to enjoy yourself as you desire, so await the approach of death. . . The four sages during their life had not a single day's joy. Since their death they have had a grand fame. But that fame is what no one who cares for what is real would choose. Celebrate them—they do not know it; reward them—they do not know it. The two villains Kee and Chow during their lifetime had the joy of gratifying their desires. Since their death they have had the evil fame of folly and tyranny. But the reality of enjoyment is what no fame can give. Reproach them—they do not know it. To the sages all admiration is given; yet their lives were bitter to the end. To the villains all condemnation is given; yet their lives were pleasant to the last. Alive they were Kee and Chow; dead they were so much rotten bone. Who could know any difference between their rotten bones? While alive then let us hasten to make the best of life: what leisure have we to be thinking of anything after death?"

Against the grossness of this, Mencius "set his face like a flint." Dr. Legge says:—

"Never did Christian priest lift up his mitred front or show his shaven crown, or wear his Geneva gown more loftily in courts and palaces than Mencius, the teacher, demeaned himself." "Those," he said, "who give counsel to the great, should despise them, and not look at their pomp and display. Halls several fathoms high, with beams projecting several cubits—these, if my wishes were to be realised, I would not have. Food spread before me over ten cubits square, and attendant girls to the number of hundreds;—these though my wishes were realised, I would not have . . . Pleasure and wine and the dash of hunting with thousands of chariots following after me;—these, though my wishes were realised, I would not have."

His writings abound with pithy and powerful moral maxims. Of the personal influence of the sovereign, Mencius says:—"When a ruler rejoices in the joy of his people, they also rejoice in his joy; when he grieves in the sorrow of his people, they also grieve at his sorrow. A sympathy of joy will pervade the empire; a sympathy of sorrow will do the same."

The appreciation of the *vox populi* was as high in the old empire as in any democracy:—"When all those about you (*i.e.* the King) say 'this man won't do,' don't listen to them. When all your great officers say, 'this man won't do,' don't listen to them. When the people all say, 'this man won't do,' then examine into the case."

The superiority of moral conviction to physical compulsion is thus stated:—"When one by force subdues men, they do not submit to him in heart. They submit because their strength is not adequate to resist. When one subdues men by virtue, in their hearts' core, they are pleased, and sincerely submit."

Here is a Free-trade maxim more than two thousand years old:— "If at his (the King's) frontier passes there be an inspection of persons, but no taxes charged on goods or other articles, then all the travellers of the empire will be pleased and wish to make those tours on his roads."

The sage held that the most prolific source of civilization and success lay not in natural advantages, but in the man:—"Advantages of situation afforded by the earth are not equal to the union arising from the accord of men." The value of property and possessions as a moral and political ballast is thus set forth:—"If the people have not a certain livelihood they have not a fixed heart (stability). If they have not a fixed heart, there is nothing they will not do in the way of self-abandonment, of moral deflection, of depravity, and of wild license."

"A rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven," said Christ. "He who seeks to be rich will not be benevolent; he who wishes to be benevolent will not be rich," said Mencius.

Let us cull some of the specimens from the great master Confucius himself, premising that they are "picked specimens" from amidst platitudes and vagueness, which, to the European intellect are barely tolerable.

The Master said:—"Fine words and an insinuating address are rarely associated with true virtue."

His counsels to youth are:—"A youth when at home should be filial, and abroad respectful to his elders. He should be earnest and truthful. He should overflow in love to all, and cultivate the friendship of the good."

Here is a triplet:—"Hold faithfulness and sincerity as first principles. Have no friends not equal to yourself. When you have faults do not fear to abandon them."

Again,—"I do not know how a man without truthfulness is to get on. How can a carriage be made to go without the cross-bar for yoking the oxen to?"

To a ruler:—"He who exercises government by means of his virtue may be compared to the North Pole star, which keeps its place, and all the stars turn round it."

This smacks of Carlyle almost:—"The superior man thinks of virtue, the small man of comfort. The superior man thinks of the sanctions of the law, the small man of the favours he may receive."

The next reminds one of the "Analogy"—"Virtue is not left to stand alone; he who practises it will have neighbours."

His own mental developement is thus formulated. It suggests some doubts as to the correctness of the sage's self analysis—"At fifteen I had my mind bent on learning. At thirty I stood firm. At forty I had no doubts. At fifty I knew the decrees of heaven. At sixty my ear was an obedient organ for the reception of truth. At seventy I could follow what my heart desired without transgressing what was right."

Our own proverb about a "little learning" is paralleled, and the "cram system" is touched on in a sentence:—"Learning without thought is labour lost, and thought without learning is perilous."

Free thinking did not commend itself to Confucius. "The study of strange doctrines is injurious indeed."

Moral courage is defined:—"To see what is right and not to do it, is want of courage."

One is astonished at the overweening estimate of a knowledge of right without the practice of it:—"If a man in the morning hear the right way, he may die in the evening without regret."

The Biblical estimate of man's sinfulness seems equalled in the following:—"I have not seen a person who loved virtue or hated what was not virtuous." "It is all over! I have not yet seen one who could perceive his faults and inwardly accuse himself.'"

The "golden rule" is given in its negative form, but not in its positive; "Tsze said, "What I do not wish men to do to me, I also wish not to do to men." The Master replied, "Tsze, you have not attained to that."

Of the will—"The commander of the forces of a large state may be carried off, but the will of even a common man cannot be taken from him."

There is such a ring of the Book of Proverbs about these analects that we venture to close our quotations with the same subject as Solomon did—the virtuous woman. Here is the Chinese picture—

> **"Man is the representative of Heaven, and is supreme over all things. Woman yields obedience to the instructions of man, and helps to carry out his principles. On this account she can determine nothing of herself. When young she must obey her father and elder brothers; when married she must obey her husband; when her husband is dead she must obey her son. Woman's business is simply the preparing and supplying of wine and food. Beyond the threshold of her apartments she should not be known for evil or for good; she may take no step on her own motion, and may come to no conclusion on her own consideration."**

It is not a high ideal, and the wonder is that Chinamen are what they are, springing from such a vapid mind-beggared motherhood.

It scarcely lies within our scope to contrast the Confucian scheme with Christianity; but to put it in brief. Confucius banished from his philosophy the name of *God*, which till then prevailed, and substituted for it an impersonal principle, naming it *Heaven*. We have thus lost the sublimity, the expansiveness, the spiritual poetry, and the keen poignancy of moral emotion which Theism alone can generate. We miss all the ennobling belief in immortality, both its moral leverage as an incitement to duty and its high consolation in the face of death. He was even disingenuous enough to inculcate the "worship of the ancestors," without averring whether they existed or not. But the people have supplied of themselves what the sage left unsaid—

> "Argue with them," says Meadows, "and they are unmistakably atheists; let them talk themselves, . . . and you find them influenced by a belief in a supreme, intelligent, rewarding and punishing Power, with more or less of *will* and *personality*."

"In the sage," says Dr. Legge, "we have a philosopher whose glance is searching, and his penetration deep; but there is wanting that moral sensibility which would draw us to him." As for the fallen and the vicious, now and then you have an "alas for them!" followed only by firm injunction and stern rebuke. You could not produce from the whole range of Chinese literature the peculiar unique mental effect created by the one sentence of Christ's—"Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

II. The Poetry of Ancient China we can but touch, giving a few specimens. It dates back to 1765 B.C., and was compiled by Confucius, much as the Homeric poems were gathered by the Pisistratidæ. It is singularly free from licentious sentiments. It is highly theistic, indicating, as all the oldest poetry of the world does, a primæval Theism which after ages lost. Though rarely rising to the sublime, it is at times full of the pathos of a suffering nation. Its system of parallelisms and repetitions reminds us of the Hebrew poetry. Its great value is, however, in its being the pourtrayal of the feelings and employments, the hopes and the fears of one of the oldest peoples on the earth.

It is only right to put aside what may shortly look like a plagiarism. The following poetical versions were made during leisure moments by the writer of this paper, for a volume of Chinese poetry, by Dr. Legge, which is about to appear.

ODE TO KING WAN, ABOUT 1100 B.C.

Heav'n shields and sets thee fast,
Secure 'gainst every blast,
    Thy virtue pure;
That every joy be thine
Increase of corn and wine,
And every gift divine
    Abundant sure.

Heav'n shields and sets thee fast;
Thou every virtue hast;
    Thy ways are right.
Her choicest gifts she'll pour
That last for ever more;
Nor time exhaust the store,
    Nor day nor night.

Heav'n shields and sets thee fast,
Makes thine endeavour last
    And prosper well.
Like hills and mountains high,
Whose ridges touch the sky,
Like streams aye surging by,
    Thine increase swell.

With rite and auspice fair,
Thine off'rings thou dost bear,
    And son-like give—
In summer, winter, spring—
To olden duke and king,
Who thee, eternal sing,
    For ever live.

The spirits of the dead
Pour blessings on thy head,
    Unnumber'd, sweet.
Thy subjects simple good,
Enjoy their drink and food;
And tribes of every blood
    Follow thy feet.

Like moons that wax in light,
Or suns that scale the height,
    Or ageless hill,
As pine and cypress grow,
Nor change nor autumn know,
The sons that from thee flow
    Be lasting still.

The following is an allegorical piece, the moral always occurring in the line prior to the illustration, the peculiarity being that the latter only is given by the poet, but the creative (!) mind of the commentators perceives the former in it:—

All true words fly, as from yon reedy marsh
The crane rings o'er the wild its discord harsh.
And reason right in fetters none can keep,
Nor bind the fish by islet, shore or deep.

Sin lurks near right, as 'neath those sandal trees
Their withered leaves the merest searcher sees.
The hurtful ne'er without some good was born,
These stones that mar the hill would grind your corn.

All true words spread, as from the marsh's eye
The crane's sonorous note ascends the sky.
And goodness in no narrow circle hides,
As fish by islet, shore or deep sea glides.
And lesser good near greater you shall see,
And find the paper shrub near sandal tree.
Good still emerges from what man condemns,
These stones that mar the hill would polish gems.

The following, if somewhat long, is a fine exhibition of the mingling of religious sentiment with historical narrative, showing the rise of the House of Chow under T'ae, K'e, and Wan to the sovereignty of all China:—

O great is God! To earth He bent His eye,
And every corner of the land did try
For one to rule the state with equity.

These earlier kings had practised only ill,
And, ruling, ruled not after Heaven's great will.
Thro' all the states God therefore searchéd still.

He searched for one who might the sceptre sway;
And westward turn'd from all large states away,
And lordly rule at last bestow'd on T'ae.

Straight set the king to make wild nature trim,
To clear the forest of the rotting limb;
An open cultured land it grew for him.

He tilled and trimmed the bosky clumps and rows;
He cleared the marsh where cane or willow grows,
And thinned the thickets where the mulberry blows.

When God brought here as king this sagely man,
Fast fled away the barbarous hordes of Kwan.
Heav'n gave his spouse and fixed its destined plan.

God looked upon the hills where thorn and oak
A virgin forest stood ;—but now there broke
Paths through the firs that human feet bespoke.

God raised the state and for the state a king.
T'aepih and K'e dwelt both beneath his wing.
It is this K'e whose praises now I sing.

A brother's love full orb'd within him glow'd.
He to his brother rendered all he owed.
Each thought and deed were for his country's good.

And this King K'e, God gave him wisdom high ;
And far abroad his fame spread silently.
His virtue great he used intelligently.

Most keen, most wise, to lead or to command,
To hold paternal sway o'er this great land,
He stood 'twixt kings and chiefs a cordial band.

When virtuous Wan at length assumed the crown,
No wrong detracted from his fair renown.
On him and his, God sent His blessings down.

God spake to Wan :—" Be not thou like to those
Whose will now clings to this, to that now goes ;
Whose facile minds veer with each wind that blows."

So grandly climbed he to fair virtue's crown.
The men of Meih his rule dared to disown,
Dared to resist this great land which we own.

Invading Yuen they 'gainst Kung conspire.
Then rose our king majestic in his ire,
With marshalled troops to make the foe retire.

To fix on basis firm the state of Chow,
And to fulfil his kingly word and vow,
Which he had pledged to God, and men below.

Calm in his capital, the king abode ;
His troops from utmost Yuen held the road ;
O'er every ridge right valiantly they strode.

No foreign foeman ranged along our hills—
Nor high nor low ; nor drank our springs nor rills,
Nor touched the pools that trickling brooklet fills.

God spake to Wan :—" I love your virtue wise,
Not blatant-tongued, nor flashed in common eyes,
Not seeking fickle change nor rude surprise—

All unpremeditated and all free from art
It leads you to enact the noblest part—
A pattern king according to God's heart!"

God spake to Wan :—"Straight with your brethren go,
War-ladders take, and engines, to bring low
The walls of Tsung, and thus defeat the foe."

The warlike engines gently first they ply
Against the walls of Tsung both great and high.
Their captives one by one with torture try.

No hurrying hand shore off the dead man's ear!
To God he offered, to the Lord of war,
That they might yield and none resist him dare.

Then forceful all the engines move along
Against the wall of Tsung so high and strong;
He on it hurled his force, one eager throng.

Its rites he quenched in human blood.
The eye scarce knows where once it stood.
None dared resist, of all the rebel brood.

JOHN LEGGE.

THE SUPERNATURAL.

No subject is at present more deeply engaging the minds of thinking men than that which the Rev. A. Gosman has lately treated in this *Review*, in an elaborate article. Agreeing with him in much, I seek the opportunity of criticising some portion of what he has written, and of supplying some considerations that seem called for. He demands, *in limine*, if not a logical definition, at least "such a description of the supernatural as will satisfy our minds, and clear away from them the mists of indefiniteness and the haze of uncertainty." What he must intend is to ask those who do use the phrase, what they mean by it, in what sense they use it. He himself uses it to signify "the doctrine which affirms the existence of intelligent creatures, above or outside the sphere of human intelligence." This certainly is not a logical definition, and as a "description" somewhat inadequate. There may be intelligent creatures outside our system who belong to a system of nature of their own, under which they take their place in the order of creation; and therefore they are not strictly supernatural beings. I should rather be disposed to distinguish the natural as the phenomenal, that which is made known to us in experience, under the forms of time and space; and the supernatural as that which has an existence apart from the phenomena of nature, and is itself the source of life and being.

The question has been asked, not only whether there is such a supernatural kind of existence, but whether it has actually revealed itself in the order of nature. Apart from all inference from nature itself, there is the answering assertion that there have been, in the history of man, supernatural occurrences which have been placed on record. The urgent question, therefore, is—Is this a rational belief? Now Mr. Gosman endeavours to distinguish three ways of reconciling the apparently exceptional character of such facts with the prevalence of law, but does so only to dismiss them, as all alike unsatisfactory. The first, when reduced to a few words, would seem to be that they are facts or phenomena, not in reality other than natural, but which do not belong to the present known system of nature. He rejects this on the ground that "a miracle, or supernatural fact," if it could be explained by the operation of natural causes of which we are ignorant, would lose its supernatural character. But there is ambiguity in the word "causes." Undoubtedly he is right if he refers to causes due to the spontaneous operation of nature. He is right, too, if he refers to the extraordinary effects produced by the application to objects in nature, of properties or agents which, though their existence was unsuspected, have all along been within the reach of human faculties. *Omne ignotum pro magnifico* is a maxim which has been quoted, with a smile of compassion or contempt, as progressive science has cleared away many a superstitious fancy. The mysteries of magic have been seen to be the rude application, in the ages of ignorance, of a by no means advanced knowledge of chemistry and optics. All those marvels once popularly assigned to celestial or infernal agency have now taken their place within the circle of things natural, exciting no surprise, and suggesting no interference of personal spiritual power. But suppose for a moment that a miracle has been wrought by the application, by a higher than human wisdom, of forces or vital energies actually existing in nature but decisively transcending the spontaneous action of nature. Suppose the thing done to be also of a kind far beyond the reach of the human faculties in the disposal and arrangement of natural agents. Here would be an act which is natural in its proximate, and supernatural in its efficient cause. If from any source, moreover, it could be ascertained that this completer sway over nature, and more compulsive use of its hidden resources, were due to the action of a personal will, endowed with inconceivably higher intelligence than man's, and in possession of all the secrets of nature, this would be an act which, even when explained, could not be reduced to the level of the natural. I do not at present say whether any such acts have ever been done on earth in the presence of human observers; but I am justified in saying that if they ever were, then to them Mr. Gosman's way of eliminating the supernatural element would not apply.

What he calls another theory of the Supernatural—that of the operation of a "higher law" in nature—is in fact not another but the same. If the natural causes which would explain the miraculous occurrence do not belong to "the present course of nature, as known to us," the operation of the unknown higher law is contained in the hypothesis. But he should not call this "a theory." It makes no pretension to that character. It is a hypothesis proposed to explain facts which claim belief on the ground of sufficient historic testimony, and yet are of such a kind as admit of no scientific explanation. It aims at the reconciliation of two distinct sets of phenomena, first, the historic facts resting on testimony, and secondly, the scientific fact that the system of nature is an orderly system. As matter of testimony, the occurrence supposed comes within the range of experience, and yet in the character of it there is that which is at variance with ordinary experience. What is suggested is, then, that the ordinary experience may not be the only possible order of nature, and that as man has a certain power over matter in so arranging and disposing causes as to produce a definite material result, it is not irrational to suppose that a superior Being to man may possess a corresponding power, and use it so as to produce effects far more striking. Mr. Gosman is disposed to disparage such a suggestion because of the modest "may be" with which it is made, but this is because he confounds what professes to be no more than a fair hypothesis with an attempt at positive proof. If he says that a mere hypothesis is of very little value, and challenges us to the proof, my reply must be that a hypothesis is of the precise value it professes to be. It furnishes an explanation, in itself reasonable, of facts which imperatively demand explanation of some kind. If I cannot prove it to be in fact the real and only possible explanation, neither can he furnish absolutely incontrovertible proof of any other. If I understand him rightly, his position is that the supernatural cannot be scientifically proved to exist, though it may be inferred from facts, nor can its existence be scientifically disproved. He takes the chief miraculous fact of the evangelic cycle, the resurrection; examines the evidence of testimony in its favour, and pronounces it such as cannot be invalidated. Then he adds: "It is for those who admit the facts and reject the theory to give some more rational and scientific explanation if they can." I presume he means, than that of the miraculous character of the facts. Of course I agree with him. But the hypothesis of the "higher law" is, if not "a scientific," at least "a rational" explanation of the phenomena, and this he—as it seems to me—very gratuitously rejects. It is not so easy to be sure that I understand him when he says "that God must be presumed to underlie supernatural facts in the same way as He is supposed to underlie and explain natural phenomena. According to this view there is no natural fact without God in it, and there is no supernatural fact that is not also the outcome of the Divine energy." This language cannot be used in a Pantheistic sense, for he had just spoken of his belief in "a personal God and a superintending Providence." If, then, he believes all, alike in the natural and the supernatural, to be the outcome of the energy of a personal God, does he not also believe that God works according to law?

And if he believes that He does so work, how does he come to regard "the higher law" with so little favour? It would be curious to ascertain also whether he regards moral evil as one of the things "that have God" in them, &c., and by what genesis of it he can reconcile its existence with goodness at the root of things. But this is by the way.

It may be worth while for a moment to pass in review the various modes of regarding supernatural incidents, by the several classes of observers in our time. The pure physicist rejects miracle absolutely, because experience cannot contradict itself: though it is proper to observe that the word "cannot" is one which he has no strict right to use, pluming himself as he does on his carefulness in confining himself to observing the order in which the phenomena actually present themselves in experience. The law which, from such a succession of phenomena, he generalises, is simply a formula announcing that which *is*, not that which *must be.* It cannot apply, for example, to such an event as the entrance on the scene of a personal Will. with powers such as I have supposed. That which *is*, not that which *can be*, is the material with which his science is conversant. We know, however, as a matter of fact, that the position of such an observer, in reference to a miracle, is that of one who refuses to discuss the question, pronouncing it *ab initio* impossible. Compared with him, the ordinary sceptic is a mere old-fashioned objector who mutters something which the other thinks not very original, about the insufficiency of the testimony, or the credulity and untrustworthiness of the witnesses. The ordinary believer of the early part of this century, in accepting the miracle, was attracted rather than repelled by the scientific difficulty, looking upon the disturbance of the order of nature as, in and by itself, a conspicuous proof of the irruption of a Divine power into the circle of terrestrial things. In the present day, there is an increasing number of believers who, satisfied with the historic testimony in favour of certain miracles, yet reject as a violent and needless hypothesis, the idea of disorderly action in the universe. They see besides in such breaking forth of miracle, a particular crisis in the great contest between good and evil, and, believing in "a moral God," recognise it as one of many converging proofs of the fact that, in this universe, goodness is the regnant power. To this last class of thinkers, the notion of the operation of a higher law, coming into view only as an unexpected revelation of a Divine goodness constantly working beneath all the anomalies and confusions of natural existence, presents itself with peculiar attraction. Whether true or not, it is at least rational. It is consistent with all they know of God and nature. Nor do I think Mr. Gosman has shown any sufficient reason for summarily discarding it.

During the remainder of this article I need no longer, however, follow the particular line of this gentleman's calm and ingenious argument. It cannot be denied that the tendency to exclude the supernatural from the universe and from humanity, which has been a salient fact ever since the appearance of the famous volume of "Essays and Reviews," is due mainly to the extraordinary claims put forth by men of science of the Materialist school. At first the claim was that theology should not intrude into the province of science, and that the study of Nature should not be perplexed by theories derived from any other source than the investigation of Nature itself. But now the physicists, not content with being left free to pursue their inquiries according to that method which they think can alone be relied on as certain, are claiming an almost absolute despotism over the whole world of thought. The being of God, the existence of Supernatural power, nay, the existence of Mind itself as anything but matter in one of its Protean forms, are relegated to the domain of the unknowable. I do not say that they alone are the writers who reject the supernatural, but from them has been received an immense impetus in that direction. Whilst they decline to pronounce an opinion on any alleged forms of existence beyond the ken of their science, they imagine that in their processes of investigation, and in the language which they are obliged to use as its implement, they are keeping strictly within it. How far this is from being the case, how inevitably they have to assume the existence of principles of subjective thought in order even to express themselves, how closely the Supernatural presses on them and the idea of it lurks under their most exact terminology, Mr. Martineau has convincingly shown in his recent articles in the *Contemporary Review*. These articles will be read with admiration and gratitude by many who are separated from him, *longo intervallo*, in matters of religious faith. I must content myself with quoting two characteristic passages.

> "This reduction," says Mr. Martineau, "of everything to matter, motion, and law, would be unimpeachable, were our intelligence somewhat differently constructed. Matter—as these expositors set out by observing—speaks to our perceptive senses alone; and we should still know it had we no more than these, and the ability to retain their vestiges and set them in order. Let us only see how things like and unlike move in place and time, and the history of matter is all before us. For this purpose we need not go beyond the relations of objectivity,

succession, and resemblance among the forms and data of the understanding. But over and above these we are subject to another determinate principle of thought—that of Causality—in virtue of which there can be no cognition of phenomenon except in relation to power that issues it, any more than there can be a cognition of a *here* without a *there*, or a *before* without an *after*. This intellectual law leaves us unsatisfied with merely reading the order of occurrence among the changes we perceive; it obliges us to refer movement to a motor, to look beyond the matter stirred to a force that stirs it, be the force *without*, as in the expansive energy which propels a loaded shell, or *within*, as in that which ultimately bursts it. In any case you have here a clear dynamic addition to that scheme of marshalled and regimented phenomena which results from the lonely conception of matter."

The Reviewer is here dealing with the Atomic and Dynamic controversy, but his words stand in close relation to his conclusion after a most careful criticism of both theories, in which the ultimate Power of the whole system is seen to be resolved into Will.

"The equipoise," he says, "is perfect in respect to validity, between the ideas of Matter and of Power; and the only question is, whether both are to be dismissed as illusions, or both retained as intuitive data of thought, the condition of all construed experience. To reject them both is practically impossible, though necessary if you part with either. To retain them both is simply to accept the fundamental relation of subject and object under its two constitutive functions, instead of treating our only modes of knowing as snares of ignorance. The existence of Universal Will and the existence of Matter stand exactly on the same basis, of certainty if you trust, of uncertainty if you distrust, the principia of your own reason. For my part, I cannot hesitate. Shall I be deterred by the reproach of Anthropomorphism? If I am to see a ruling Power in the world, is it folly to prefer a manlike to a brutelike Power, a seeing to a blind? The similitude to man means no more and goes no further than the supremacy of intellectual insight and moral ends over every inferior alternative; and how it can be childish to derive everything from the highest known order of power rather than the lowest, and to converse with nature as embodied thought, instead of taking it as a dynamic engine, it is difficult to understand."

The noble prose of Mr. Martineau inevitably recalls to our thoughts the not less noble verse of Mr. Palgrave—

If this be all in all—
  Life, but one mode of Force;
Law, but the plan which binds
  The sequences in course;
All essence, all design
  Shut out from mortal ken;
We bow to Nature's fate,
  And drop the style of men!
The summer dust the wind wafts hither
Is not more dead to whence and whither.

But if our life be life,
And thought, and will, and love
Not vague unconscious airs
That o'er wild harpstrings move;
If consciousness be aught
Of all it seems to be,
And souls are something more
Than lights that gleam and flee;
Though dark the road that leads us thither,
The heart must ask its whence and whither.

To Matter or to Force
The All is not confined
Beside the law of things
Is set the law of Mind;
One speaks in rock and star,
And one within the brain,
In unison at times,
And then apart again;
And both in one have brought us hither
That we may know our whence and whither.

It should at the same time be remembered, in dealing with a subject of this kind, that if the man of pure science complains that the inquiry is perplexed by the "prejudices" of religion—we may let the word pass—he is not equally alive to the influence exerted by the peculiar fascination of his own studies, and the tendency thereby induced, unduly to contract the boundaries of knowledge. Alexander Selkirk was indeed monarch of all he surveyed, and perhaps there were moments when the insatiable longings of his soul for a wider life seemed absolutely in abeyance; and yet beyond that realm of his lay the illimitable ocean, and reposing on its mighty bosom were many lands peopled by "articulate-speaking men:" regions full of wonder and beauty. And these examiners and interpreters of Nature repress in like manner, as feverish dreams, their aspirations after aught but the visible and tangible, deliberately restricting the search for truth to exploration of the field of nature; and then, yielding to a not ignoble illusion, think that all is within their view which they can ever really know, and that they have set to the domain of knowledge a bound that cannot be passed. Sir William Hamilton called attention to the temptations incident to such an exclusive line of study (*e. g.* of astronomy) when he said that—

"The very contemplation of an order and adaptation so astonishing, joined to the knowledge that this order and adaptation are the necessary results of a

> brute mechanism—when acting upon minds which have not learned to look into themselves for the light of which the world without can only afford them the reflection—far from elevating them more than any other aspect of external creation to that inscrutable Being who reigns beyond and above the universe of Nature, tends on the contrary to impress on them with peculiar force the conviction that, as the mechanism of nature can explain so much, the mechanism of nature can explain all. 'Wonder,' says Aristotle, is 'the first cause of philosophy;' but in the discovery that all existence is but mechanism, the consummation of science would be an extinction of the interest from which it originally sprang."—*Metaphysics, Lect. II.*

There are therefore inveterate tendencies of mind engendered by devotion to purely physical inquiries which may, in the investigation of truth, prove no less a cause of perplexity and narrowness of view, than the prejudices which are referable to education or religious prepossession. And it would appear, from what we have quoted from Mr. Martineau—and the quotations might be multiplied from other quarters—that there are writers animated by a pure love of truth, by a devotion to it which is the deepest passion of their nature, and possessing high faculty in the analysis of the contents of our knowledge, who are by no means disposed to submit, as to a foregone conclusion, to the oft-repeated declaration that nature, as it lies open to our inspection, contains no hint or suggestion of anything beyond itself. Rather is it contended that it derives its power of speaking in language intelligible and impressive to the human soul, from the fact that it is the expression to the thought within man, of a creative thought which has stamped on nature its distinctive character.

This is not a mere digression from the original line of inquiry as to the rationality of belief in supernatural occurrences in the course of human history. If this background of the supernatural can be divined as existing behind all the variety of nature, as we see and know it, it has a most obvious bearing on the present question. For if it does not heighten the probability that, in the course of events, miraculous incidents will occur in the midst of natural things, yet in signalising the presence in creation of a personal will, it at least removes somewhat of the antecedent improbability, and tends to bring such occurrences more clearly within the limits of the possible. This would be the case even if there were nothing occult in science. But it cannot even now be pretented that Butler's well-known argument is inapplicable:—" Therefore, that things be beyond the reach of our faculties is no sort of presumption against the truth and reality of them; because it is certain there are innumerable things, in the constitution and government of the universe, which are thus beyond the natural reach of our faculties." Which again we must translate into Palgrave's verse:—

We may not hope to read
  Or comprehend the whole
Or of the law of things
  Or of the law of soul:
E'en in the eternal stars
  Dim perturbations rise,
And all the searchers' search
  Does not exhaust the skies.

* * * * *

He in His science plans
  What no known laws foretell,
The wandering fires and fixed
  Alike are miracle.

In dealing with alleged supernatural occurrences, it might seem an obvious duty to consider the evidence of testimony. But it is not in reality here that the difficulty lies. That evidence is not merely sifted with the care necessary to establish any historical event of another kind; for it is not in the fact, but the nature, of the incident, that men find reason for misgiving. The real objection lies in the supposed transgression of law and departure from uniformity in the operations of nature. When the evidence is rejected, it is for the most part for this reason and no other. It is necessary, then, to show that in the case, for example, of the New Testament miracles, this is a purely factitious objection. It has been well observed by Dr. Stoughton (Modern Scepticism, p. 182) that "no definition of their character in relation to physical law, can anywhere be found in this ancient record. They are not spoken of as violations of law, or as suspensions of law, or as interferences with law, or as contradictions to law." Hardly any of the more deep-thinking of recent apologists would now deem it at variance with a true reading of the history to regard them, when the attempt is made to theorise on their nature, as due to the operation of some law which we are unable to identify. Canon Liddon, the champion of orthodoxy, although he speaks of miracle as "an innovation upon physical law," yet immediately corrects himself with the alternative, " or at least a suspension of some lower law by the intervention of a higher one" (*Elements of Religion*, p. 74.), which it is obvious to remark is in fact not "a suspension" of law but the assertion of it in the superior power of the higher. It is observed by another writer that there is nothing in them of anarchy or disorder—"they throw nothing out of gear." But in the familiar language about " the reign of law," and the like, which has become so popular, it is important to point out that strict scientific language is often used in a very unscientific, and therefore in a very misleading sense. Law in the scientific sense does not mean that force is put upon nature to act in a particular manner, but only that in the same circumstances the same phenomena have always been observed. To this constantly recurring repetition of the same effects a name is given implying some principle as the cause of the recurrence, but it is always conceivable that in the progress of discovery even this may prove to be a subordinate instead of a primordial fact of physical nature. Moreover, when we say that in material existence everything must be according to law, we mean that in the arrangement and disposition there must be, that is, there can be, or will be, no outrage of the essential character of the thing dealt with, no setting aside of the essential properties or conditions of matter. But whereas we do know, as has been already hinted, that we have within our own sphere considerable power of arresting the action of one law of matter, or modifying it by another, we do not know to what extent a Being with a free will, able to act in a wider sphere, may use His freedom in a corresponding way. But, assuming the general coherence of nature, we conclude that in whatsoever way that freedom may be exercised, it will be by an orderly and not an arbitrary and anarchic exercise of will.

There is another caution against the fallacious use of scientific language, which Canon Westcott has very justly interposed—

> " A law of nature can mean nothing else than the law of the human apprehension of phenomena. We are forced to regard things under conditions of time and space and the like, and the consequence is that phenomena are grouped together under certain rules. We find that for us (such is the limitation of our powers) the sequence of phenomena is this and not that. Partial sequences are compared and combined, and thus more general sequences are discovered. But however far we may go, we never go beyond ourselves. The law at last is a law for men; its form depends on limitations which are characteristic of men. We have not the least reason for supposing that it has any absolute existence. For to say that things when observed by men will be observed by them under such and such limitations, and therefore according to such and such laws, is obviously a very different thing from saying that such and such are the laws of things in themselves, and for all intelligent beings."—*Gospel of the Resurrection*, p. 24.

These are considerations which are far too much excluded from view in much of the popular writing on this subject, and still more in the facile omniscience of Club and Society talk.

In judging of the reasonableness of this class of miracles, we have also a right to insist that they shall be regarded not only in their connection with the established succession of physical phenomena, but in their connection with the moral order of the universe. They do not appear on the scene as blank unmeaning facts which startle the senses and no more, but, whatever else is obscure, the moral meaning of them is the thing which is manifest. If they are not illusions, but things which have been really done, there can be no doubt about the character that belongs to them. That character is positive and significant, and it is good and not evil. Because of this their harmony with our moral nature, they overpower the reason without unsettling it. For, as was happily said by the late Frederic Myers: "If we could conceive of a case in which for any thoughtful mind the conviction of the existence of miracle, and that of the immorality of the doctrine which it is assumed to confirm, were equally strong—such a mind would probably become insane." In our own day the advocates of spiritualism have put forth claims which in reality amount to miracle; for they do not attribute the phenomena to the operation of occult law, but to the visitations of supernatural agency. I pronounce no opinion on the alleged facts, but the weakness of the system is, the meagreness of the moral evidence in the truths communicated, of their having come from a region nobler than our own, or of their having done anything to raise the prevailing standard of what is good. The miracles of Christianity are no visitations of spirits who whisper and peep, who peer and mutter, who come when they are beckoned and go when they are not wanted for the satisfaction of a prurient curiosity; but they are —if indeed they are true—revelations of a moral God. To those who believe them to be true, the crowning attraction is, that there with awful reverence they contemplate their greater mastery over nature, this profounder insight into its secrets, in One who best of all men bore the brunt of moral temptation, and there also had proved his mastery. Again, we have to distinguish the essential character of a supernatural incident which shall be held not to contradict our reason. It is admitted that the ordinary succession of the phenomena is departed from, but it is not admitted that any effect has been wrought on the subject of the miracle which is at variance with the peculiarities of its proper nature. The one thing in which such an effe [illegible] entiated from other ordinary effects of the same kind is, that in the former the causal will is present and manifest, whereas in the latter it is out of sight and remote, though in the last resort (if even only at the first origin of the chain of causes), no less really operating. And in the instances of miracle which have been under consideration, there is a peculiarity of selection which is a most striking feature of them. Science has gone some way in showing the power a mind may have over matter, and especially in a living organism over the functions of sensation and life: and considered in the light of science, it is rather the truth that these miraculous acts have outrun, than that they have contradicted it. They are in accordance with what we know of the properties and laws of matter and of its relation to mind, and it is the nervous system, which is the great channel of communication between them, that is there for the most part the chosen agent in the hands of the supernatural power. The miracles in question have their natural as well as their supernatural side. They do not follow the slow processes of nature as we are accustomed to observe them; but slowness or rapidity is a thing which has reference, not to the subject of the action in its essential nature, but wholly to the faculties of the observer. (The same principle will apply to what are called the miracles of nature.) The regularity of the ordinary changes excites in us no surprise, and perhaps makes no vivid suggestion to us of a Divine operation, because of their regularity, because of that constancy in nature which throws us off our guard. And on the other hand, the miraculous changes, although equally part of a system of order, yet are performed in such a manner and with such a rapidity of action that our slow faculties cannot trace the series of essential changes; they excite our surprise because our knowledge lags so far behind; so that beneath the visible and phenomenal the real root of all causation is inevitably suggested.

That anthropomorphism with which the believer in the supernatural is often recklessly charged, is, indeed, the real cause working deeply in the nature of many of those who reject this belief. They fasten on the Creative Power the infirmities and disabilities of their own minds. They forget that

> . . . . We that are not all,
> As parts, can see but parts, now this, now that,
> And live, perforce, from thought to thought, and make
> One act a phantom of succession: thus
> Our weakness somehow shapes the shadow, Time."

This also has been well put by Canon Westcott:—

"If we reflect, there is something strangely absurd in applying to the Divine

Power conclusions which are based on human apprehensions of things. We must, because we are finite, conceive of things as happening in time; and in the same way we must conceive of God as acting, whenever he acts, in time; but it is equally clear that we must not argue as if time really belonged to the Divine relation to the world, or as if God acted at this time or that, one after another. Any conclusion which rests on this supposition as a premises is radically false."

Enough has now been said, I think, to show that if on other grounds the evidence of miracles is sufficient, the belief in them is at least not an irrational belief. And this may be affirmed of all other supernatural occurrences, sufficiently proved by testimony, where in the effects produced there is no essential incongruity between the action and the nature of the person or thing subjected to it.

It is certainly not true that the believers in the supernatural, or the believers in a revelation which professes to be a partial unveiling of the supernatural with a view to a specific beneficent end, occupy a position in which they cannot afford to welcome the progress of scientific inquiry or speculation, lest it should—one is almost ashamed to quote the ignominious words—" weaken the defences of the supernatural system." The world is in their view a Kosmos, and as in the moral sphere by the help of revelation the connexion of the order with an eternal purpose of Divine love is discovered to them to their infinite relief, so in the physical sphere they are always learning from the interpreters of nature lessons which strengthen their faith and deepen their awe; nor have they any interest in opposing any scientific theory that may be proposed, except the general interest they have in common with all men of intellectual integrity in upholding that, and that alone, which is true. To them all discovery of nature must be a revelation of God. The strength of their own belief gives them calmness to read the various page of nature, even in its most troubled passages, with unshaken trust; to listen to the thunder and not be afraid; to contemplate the working of law even in its apparently sternest and most pitiless aspect, to witness the agonies of the dumb creatures, and the deeper because the more profoundly spiritual sufferings of living men, and be able to connect all this with an infinite love which consummated itself in sorrow and crowned itself with thorns; and meanwhile to watch, with an interest that never tires, all the development of nature and progress of humanity. The enlightened men of this generation have furnished many illustrations of the prevalence of law in nature. But the fact itself has never been in doubt. It was long ago proclaimed by Richard Hooker, who said: "All things therefore do work after a sort according to a law." And he could say this, not with less but more force of conviction because he was able to add: "Whereof some superior, unto whom they are subject, is author; only the works and operations of God have Him both for their worker and for the law whereby they are wrought. The Being of God is a kind of law to His working, for that perfection which God *is*, doth give perfection to that He *doth*." Nay, even amid the crude science of old Israel, there was one who, by an anticipative leap of inspired thought, could say of the things of nature, to the men of his day: "He hath made them fast for ever and ever; He hath given them a law which shall not be broken." These flashings forth of great truth on men who have not discovered it by the ordinary processes, are the analogy, in the history of mind, of the unexpected operations of law in the midst of organized existence. The Supernatural, which always closely besieges our life, breaking through the darkness of human thought in bursts of inspiration, has also in witness of the highest moral truth, on fit occasion, made itself unexpectedly felt as a Power sensitive to the groans of creation, and affording us significant suggestions of what nature may be at its best.

A. RUSSEL.

NORMAN MACLEOD, D.D.[*]

DURING the last ten years, Scotland has lost many of her great ecclesiastical leaders. Death has been erasing from the muster-roll of the Kirk not a few names such as those of Lee, Guthrie, Candlish, Cook, Campbell and Buchanan, so familiar to all who are acquainted with modern Scottish church history. Among the foremost of these stands that, alas! of Norman Macleod, perhaps the best known and most popular Scotchman of our time, and "taking him all in all," one of the best types of a Scotchman and of a Scotch parson. His name is a household word in every nook and corner of his native land, it is well known in England and Ireland, and although his life was for the most part spent labouring in what Sydney Smith called "that garret of the earth," his fame has penetrated to the most distant lands, and we are much mistaken if even in these colonies his name and his face are not to many bound up with other pleasing and striking memories of "Auld Scotland."

The memoir which Mr. Donald Macleod has lately given to the public will not diminish his brother's reputation as a man and a minister. Perhaps there are things which we would rather had been omitted; illustrations of piety and humour on which, however significant to family and friends, the public eye need not have been asked to rest. Somewhat fuller notices also of the times in which Macleod lived and of the movements, religious and political, in which he was interested or acted a part, might have tended to relieve any little monotony in the "Memoir," and to give a more decided background to the portrait. Taken as a whole, however, the work has been well executed, and will compare favourably with many other specimens of biographical literature. Mr. Macleod writes the little that he does write, in a clear and tasteful style, and has succeeded in giving perhaps as truthful a delineation as it was possible to give of one who had to be seen and heard in order to be thoroughly understood. To his friends and admirers, the biography of Norman Macleod will be most welcome—to Scotchmen, like a breeze from their own Highland hills—to others, even to those who differ from his theology and who cannot sympathise with the form of his piety, a book which can be read with interest and profit—while to his detractors, of whom he had not a few, it will show how frequently they misunderstood and slandered a good man.

---

[*] "Memoir of Norman Macleod, D.D., Minister of Barony Parish, Glasgow," by his brother, the Rev. Donald Macleod, B.A., Editor of *Good Words*.

The story of Norman Macleod's life, as told by his brother and by himself in his journal and letters, is an extremely simple one. Its very charm is its simplicity. It reminds us of one of his own much-loved Highland streams rushing impetuously over rocks, making music as it goes, but ever and anon reposing in deep shady pools, from which again it murmurs downward to the ocean. From first to last he is a thorough child of nature. Not even the atmosphere of royal courts or church-courts, nor his travels in foreign countries, could destroy the fresh genial spirit of the man, full always of almost boyish enthusiasm and tender affection, susceptible to every influence, intoxicated with the love of sea and earth and sky, and glowing with warm sympathy for men.

Norman Macleod was the son of a Highland minister in connection with the Church of Scotland. He was born in the year 1812, in the little seaport town of Campbeltown, on the east coast of Argyleshire, so famous for whiskey and herrings. His parents were pious, and apparently combined with their piety a geniality and wisdom which made the boyhood of Norman the bright and jolly life on which in later years he looked back with such romantic pleasure. He received the common education of the middle class at the Parish school, an institution once so famous in Scotland, but now supplanted by an altogether new order of things. Not the least important part, also, of his education was that which he received in the school of Nature, from mountains and streams, or from ships and sailors, the great objects of his boyish interest.

The four years which every young man preparing for the ministry of the Church of Scotland is expected to devote to the study of classics, philosophy, and science, were spent by Macleod at the University of Glasgow, not far from which bustling city lay the village and parish of Campsie, to which his father had now been translated from Campbeltown.

Norman does not seem to have been a very devoted student. He dabbled in the sciences, learned drawing and music, and found pleasure in general literature; and when, perhaps, he ought to have been applying himself with diligence to logic and metaphysics, his brother tells us that he was contemplating the publication of a volume of tales and poems! The power of mimicry, which he afterwards wisely controlled, and the enormous fund of humour, which to the last never failed him, had in these college days unlimited swing and exposed him to the temptation to waste precious time in merry-making and in student society, which should have been spent in more serious occupations. "He was ever ready," we are told, in these days, "with the most apt quotations from Shakspeare, Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Keats, or with some telling story, or, brimming over with fun, he would improvise crambo rhymes, sometimes most pointed, always ludicrous, or bursting into song, throw more nature into its expression than I almost ever heard from any singer." We can understand what a favorite such a youth as is here described must have been in student circles, but such social qualities are always dangerous to real student life. In 1831 Macleod entered upon the course of theological studies imposed upon every aspirant to the ministry of the Scotch Kirk, and which extends over a period of from three to four years; five months of each year being devoted to attendance at the lectures and examinations of the theological professors, and the other seven months of the year being left free to be devoted to private study; or often, as in the case of Macleod, to private teaching in some wealthy family. For three years he acted as private tutor to the son of an English proprietor in Yorkshire, sometimes residing in the house of his pupil, in England; at another time, superintending his pupil's studies, while himself a student in Edinburgh, or for several months travelling with him in Germany. To a young man of observation, no training can be more advantageous than seeing the world and mixing with men and women of different manners and ideas from his own. For one especially preparing for the ministry, such experience is invaluable. To Macleod's residence in England, where of course he attended the services of the Church of England and joined in her communion, as well as to his early introduction to German society, may perhaps be traced in part that liberality of sentiment in church matters which in these days was so little characteristic of many among the Scottish clergy. Norman seems to have devoted more time and attention to the special study of theology than he had devoted to the studies prescribed in the first part of his college curriculum. General literature, however, was still his delight. Coleridge, Shakespeare and Wordsworth were his idols, and perhaps, on the whole, they were more wholesome and useful teachers of a divinity student than Hill, Chalmers, or Welsh. A characteristic anecdote of his life at this time, illustrating his youthful enthusiasm for Wordsworth, is told by himself in his journal:—

> "I have seen, talked, and spent two or three hours with Wordsworth. I set off in the morning with a note of introduction by myself, for myself. I arrived at the door of a sweet beautiful cottage, and was ushered into a small parlour with a small library, chiefly filled with books of poetry, among which was a fine edition of Dante. Presently the old man came in, in an old brown great coat, large straw hat, and umbrella, and ushered me into a small, plainly furnished parlour. Here we sat some time, talking about Germany, its political state, and the character of its inhabitants—of the Scotch Church, and the levelling system and right of voting; and here he read me the note from his last volume. . . . . I blessed the dear old man, came away; and he said he might wander into my house some day or other in Scotland. Oh! how I felt as I heard him read some of his own imperishable verses—the lovely evening—the glorious scene—the poetry and the man!"

Besides his love of these great leaders of English literature, Macleod was in his early days deeply interested in politics, and a great admirer of Peel. The right of electing a Lord Rector which is vested in the students of a Scottish university, creates among them an interest in politics and in political leaders which, if sometimes somewhat farcical, is yet not without its advantages. Into the heart of these elections, with all their accompaniments of speechifying, pamphleteering, squibbing, and suppering, Macleod seems to have entered heart and soul, and on one occasion it is recorded of him that at the banquet which the Conservative party gave to their great leader on his coming to Glasgow to address the students who had elected him to fill the Rectorial chair, the eloquence of young Norman, in replying to the toast of the students, attracted the attention even of Peel.

In 1838 he entered upon the regular work of the ministry, having been in that year ordained to the charge of Loudoun Parish in Ayrshire. Among "Loudoun's bonnie woods and braes" he spent five happy and useful years, labouring hard among the "Covenanting" farmers of the rural district, and the free-thinking chartist weavers of the two villages which lay within the bounds of his parish. In the extracts from his letters and journal of this period which are presented to us in the "Memoir," we trace the same generous-hearted, earnest and pious man who afterwards became so well known to the world, but it is interesting to notice how much his views and feelings deepened and changed in later years from what they were in these first years of his ministry. He was always more or less characterised by openness and honesty, and even at this time he was thinking after his own fashion, and breaking away from rigid orthodoxy, although he was still "sound" on the question of the Sabbath, and of the "Burns Centenary." He was not a scholar, but general reading, great power of observation, and knowledge of men, had taught him many things which others learn in a different way. "See as many persons as you possibly can," was his sage advice to his brother Donald—"as various types of opinion as possible. Be not ashamed to confess ignorance, and be always asking, and you will learn much. Men—men, meet men!"

"Men—men, meet men," seems to have been very much his chief motto.

> "I feel with you," he writes to John Mackintosh, the "Earnest Student," then at Cambridge, "that our 'inner men' did not commune sufficiently when you were here. There was more of rubbing of surfaces than a melting together of two souls. . . . . There are many points in theology upon which I somehow think you are destined, like myself, to undergo a change, and about these I am very anxious to communicate with you; such as the universality of the atonement, the nature of saving faith, the doctrine of assurance, and the sacraments. I have been reading, writing, meditating, preaching, and praying upon these subjects, and I feel the necessity of having such clear definite ideas upon them as will stand examination."

In his manner of doing his work as a parish minister, we see the same practical common sense views of things by which in later years he was distinguished, already developing themselves. His principle was to become "all things to all men," and to meet his brother man wherever he could find a single point of contact.

> "I have got Buckland's map," he writes, describing his labours among the weavers of Loudoun. "I have got Buckland's map copied on a large scale, and we begin a spring course of Geology to not less, I am persuaded, than six or seven hundred people! I think this is a practical lesson. Let a minister use every means to come in contact with every class, to win them first on common ground, and from thence endeavour to bring them to holy ground. Only fancy a fossil fern from the coal, the solitary specimen in the mineralogical cabinet of the institution going the round of Newmilus as an unheard-of curiosity! Poor souls! if you knew how I do love the working classes."

In 1843, Norman Macleod was presented to the Parish of Dalkeith which lies not far from the Scottish metropolis. That was a memorable year in the history of the kirk. The question of church government, which to many may appear a very secondary and insignificant one, is the question on which more than on any other the Scotch ecclesiastical mind has been exercised, and feelings on this subject which had been smouldering for years broke out in 1843 into a flame. The army of the church was divided into three sections—right, left, and centre. On the right were "Moderates" of the old type—men, in whom the sober, canny element of Scottish character predominated, and who, while often marked by earnestness and piety, were yet destitute of popular enthusiasm. They were "Gallios" who, as far as the rights of Christian people were concerned, "cared for none of these things." The left wing was composed of "high-flying Evangelicals." They were men on whom a double portion of the old "solemn-league-and-covenant" spirit had descended. Many of them were the most earnest and devoted ministers of the church, consumed with a zeal for the honor of Christ and of their national Zion, which, to moderate thinking persons appeared akin to fanaticism. In the centre were moderate "Evangelicals," sound in the faith, and not wanting in zeal for the cause both of true religion and of the kirk; but, in the eyes of their opponents, tainted with Erastianism and with a worldly time-serving spirit. Among the ranks of the latter stood Norman Macleod. The struggle of 1843 might be described as a struggle between the old theocratic, league-and-covenant idea of the Church as a distinct supernatural institution, the very Ark of God on which no Uzzah might dare to place his hand, and the more "Moderate" idea of it as, in one sense indeed, a Divine institution, yet as at liberty to make an honorable compromise with the Christian Cæsar who ruled the land, and to suit itself in some degree to circumstances. It was in part also a struggle between Conservative and Radical. The ultra-evangelical spirit was democratic in the extreme, and jealous of the rights of the Christian people. Those who opposed them were, many of them at least, anxious to let things alone, and thought that the People had already as much liberty as was good for them. The question which brought these two parties into fierce antagonism, and revealed the presence of these two widely divergent views of the Church, was the question of Patronage.

It would be impossible in a page or two to go into the history of all the steps in the painful controversy which resulted in the withdrawal from the State Church of Scotland of 450 ministers and elders, amid the applause and admiration of multitudes throughout the length and breadth of the land: nor is it necessary to do so in order to indicate the general nature of the struggle. The question which really lay at the root of the whole dispute seems to have been, How far is the church entitled to make laws for herself? How far can the civil courts of the land control the proceedings of the church courts as by law established? A young man, for instance, has been licensed by his Presbytery to preach the Gospel. He is presented to a parish and ordained to the spiritual charge of it according to the law alike of the church and of the country. Can the church alter this law and declare that henceforth her licentiates shall not be ordained to any charge unless they have been elected thereto in the manner which the church approves? Can a church court, recognised by the law of the land as possessed of legal jurisdiction which that law is bound to uphold, be compelled by a civil court to ordain a licentiate who has been legally presented to a parish? The answer which the State gave to this question was, The church cannot, without an Act of Parliament, alter the law as to the election of a minister. The right of a patron to present, and the right of a licentiate to be presented, are rights established by the law of the land; and until the law is altered, the church courts must ordain *any legally qualified presentee.* The theocratic and democratic spirit rose in rebellion. The church, said they, is Christ's household. He alone has a right to rule there. He alone can determine how ministers are to be appointed. The rights of the Christian people are being invaded. The civil courts are daring to compel us to perform a spiritual act and to ordain an overseer in Christ's household. Cæsar is trampling upon the authority of "King Jesus," and the State is threatening to absorb the church. Let all who are friends of Christ and the people come forth from this Egyptian bondage. "Once more," wrote M'Cheyne, "King Jesus stands at an earthly tribunal, and they know Him not." "Did I not know," said Guthrie, "that God rules on earth as well as in Heaven," you might write "Ichabod" already on the brow of Scotland . . . . We shall leave the church; we shall give them their stipends, their manses, their glebes, and their churches. These are theirs, and let them make a "kirk or a mill" of them. But we cannot give them up the Crown rights of Christ, and we cannot give them up our people's privileges."

Such was the general nature of the question which finally rent asunder the "Auld Kirk," and led to the formation of that large and influential church, the Free Church of Scotland. Norman Macleod could hardly, at this crisis, be called a leader, in the strict sense of the word, but he was a prominent member of that party who, although they had much in sympathy with those who left, yet remained within the church, and his letters and speeches at this time serve to explain the feelings and motives by which he and others were actuated in refusing to join the popular side, and casting in their lot with the "Moderates." "Never did I pass such a fortnight of care and anxiety," he writes, alluding to the Assembly of 1843, "never did men engage in a task with more oppression of spirit than we did as we tried to preserve this church for the benefit of our children's children." Again in the same year he writes to the "Earnest Student"—

> "As to spiritual independence: In spite of all the court of session can do or has done, there is not a thing in God's Word which I have not as much freedom to obey in the church as out of it. I cannot lay my hand on my heart and say, I leave the establishment because in it I cannot obey Christ, or do so much for His glory in it as out of it. . . . . I cannot incur the responsibility of weakening the establishment—that bulwark of Protestantism—that breakwater against the waves of democracy and of revolution—that ark of a nation's righteousness—that beloved national Zion, lovely in its strength, but more beloved in the day of its desolation and danger."

Nothing brings out the contrast better between the feelings of earnest men on both sides of the controversy, than to read the different accounts of the "disruption," as given in Macleod's letters and "Cracks about the Kirk," and in the autobiography and memoir of such a man as Guthrie, who was as distinguished a member of the Free Church as Macleod was of the Establishment. What the one looked upon as a matter of expediency, the other regarded in the light of solemn duty. What the one considered as of secondary importance, the other considered as touching the very life of the Church. What the one looked upon as a useful institution through which he could serve God and do good to man, the other looked upon as a thing in itself holy and sacred. While the one thought that the Church existed for the sake of making men loving and Christ-like, the other thought that the Church is also an end in itself, and that the action of those who would permit the civil court to decide questions which he believed he could prove from Scripture it was the part only of an ecclesiastical court to decide, was wicked and traitorous.

Although among ourselves the traces of this sad controversy have been in great measure obliterated by the union of Presbyterians in Victoria, the ashes of these old fires still smoulder in Scotland. We can only hope that time, the growth of Christian feeling, and that wider view of truth which is being forced upon all the churches, will soon render such religious wars impossible, and draw together men who ought never to have been separated.

Norman Macleod returned from the stormy debates of 1843 in Edinburgh, to his quiet parish of Dalkeith, where he devoted himself with zeal and earnestness to parochial work which was always much more to his mind than the perturbed, unhealthy atmosphere of church courts. He set himself, as far as in him lay, to stir up a spirit of enthusiasm and religious life in the weak and forlorn Kirk of Scotland. Henceforth "Macleod" became a name well known both at home and abroad. His visit, as one of a deputation to Canada in 1845, the part which he took in the meetings of the "Evangelical Alliance," and in the founding of missionary associations, his visit to Poland to inquire into the religious movements of that country which were then attracting some attention, together with his editing of a periodical called the *Christian Magazine*, brought him more and more into notice, and at the same time gave him the great advantage of becoming acquainted with men of other nations and churches than his own. In 1851, he was appointed to Barony Church, Glasgow. It was here that Macleod became so famous. The go-ahead and somewhat free spirit of the West was far more congenial to him than the murky atmosphere of Edinburgh, and among the dense masses of his enormous parish and congregation he found ample scope for that philanthropic work in which he so much delighted, and for which he was so eminently fitted. It was, however, as editor of "Good Words," that he became most widely known. In 1860 he accepted the editorship of this magazine, which he not only continued to conduct until his death, but to which also he from time to time largely contributed. In this undertaking he met with considerable opposition from the "unco guid." Not only were the articles and stories, which he himself wrote, regarded as containing defective teaching, but it was urged also in the first place against "Good Words," that as it was a periodical which would be read on Sundays, the light and secular literature would be sure to attract the attention of young people. It held out a temptation, it was said, to its readers, to desecrate the Sabbath by reading about science and history, or amusing themselves, when they ought to have been more seriously employed. In the second place, it was objected to "Good Words," that men of well-known Broad-church sentiments were permitted to write in its pages. It is hardly possible for many of us to conceive such narrowmindedness, or the bitterness of feeling which could concentrate itself on such a minute point of opinion; but on such trivial grounds Macleod had to encounter no little opposition, and encounter it bravely he did. In answer to the first of these objections to "Good Words," he gave a characteristic reply.

> "If any members of a Christian family," he writes to an Edinburgh professor, "are compelled to endure such severe and dry exercises on the Sunday as would make them long for even the scientific articles in 'Good Words,' or what is still more common, if they are so ill-trained as to read what parental authority has forbidden, let me ask in such a case why not lock up 'Good Words?' . . . . Why not take the visitor by the throat, say at 11.55 on Saturday night, just at the moment when he is being transformed into the character of a dangerous intruder, and then incarcerate him till he becomes once more respectable at 12.5 a.m. on Monday morning."

Again he says, further on in the same letter—

> "You must consider how to dispose of all your other secular literature upon the first day of the week. What of your other secular books, and secular periodicals, and what is a still more difficult question, how are you to dispose of all your secular conversation, if science be secular? What, for example, are you to do with the secular sun, moon, and stars. . . . . . You may be led into a talk on astronomy, and may thus become as bad as Professor ——, who, as you inform me, declared from the chair of the Royal Society that he had read an article on astronomy in 'Good Words' on a Sunday evening."

In answer to the other objection against "writers belonging to different schools in theology and different departments in literature, such as Mr. Trollope, Professor Kingsley, and Dr. Stanley, writing in the same journal with other men of acknowledged "evangelical sentiments," Macleod answered, that in his opinion, "popular Christian periodical literature must be made, within of course certain limits, much wider, truer, more manly, and more human—*i.e.*, more really Christian in its sympathies than it had hitherto been."

"I have little faith," he writes, "in an *Index Expurgatorius* being wise or efficient among people of ordinary education and intelligence." "It will be a blessing," he says, in another letter, "if we give freedom to Christian literature and yet keep it within holy ground. It will be a blessing, too, if we can make good men see their way to more toleration and largeness of sympathy."

It was plain that Macleod was diverging now from the beaten paths of popular evangelicalism, and the attacks of bitter bigots perhaps drove him faster than he would otherwise have been disposed to go. He was becoming impatient of the cant and humbug which, under the garb of extreme orthodoxy and unctuous piety, seemed to be sapping the foundations of a manly and healthy religious sentiment. It appeared to him that the well-known advice of

Mephistopheles to Faust was being only too faithfully carried out by many in the church—

"Im ganzen—*haltet euch an Worte!*
Dann geht ihr durch die sichre Pforte
Zum Tempel der Gewissheit ein. . . . .
* * * * * *
Mit *Worten* lässt sich trefflich streiten,
Mit *Worten* ein System bereiten,
An *Worte* lässt sich trefflich glauben,
Von einem *Wort* lässt sich kein Iota rauben."

In 1865 his divergence from the pietism and puritanism of many of his brethren both in the Established Church and outside of it, became more apparent still in the stand which he saw fit to make on the "Sabbath Question." His Presbytery were called to consider the propriety of addressing a pastoral letter on the subject of Sabbath Observance to the congregations within their bounds. He objected to the proposed "Pastoral," on the ground that in it the sanctity of the Sabbath was rested upon purely Jewish law. The "Decalogue *quâ* Decalogue," he maintained was no longer binding upon Christians. The Lord's Day, he argued, was one of the greatest blessings possible, and for its opportunities of rest and worship every right minded person should be most thankful. The views, however, of Sunday observance held by many of his brethren were purely Jewish, besides being in many cases impracticable and absurd. It was a great day in Glasgow when Macleod fired the first shot at the prejudices and traditional beliefs of many sincere and of many insincere persons. All alone (and in this respect perhaps, he acted foolishly, for others in the Presbytery might have prepared themselves to speak on his side had he encouraged them to do so), he commenced the attack. For hours he argued, entreated, told droll stories about strict Sabbatarians which convulsed the Court with laughter, and thundered in his own characteristic way. How far he had really grasped the full meaning of his own principles it is hard to say, but he managed somehow to carry conviction to the hearts and feelings of many both among clergy and laity. Some of his equally liberal, indeed perhaps more liberal but more cautious brethren pronounced his action a mistake, but judging from the results which have followed, we cannot agree with them. There is a time to be silent, no doubt, but there is a time also when the heart of an honest man burns, and he must speak out. For several months feeling ran very high. Pulpits and meeting houses, magazines and newspapers rang with arguments and praises and denunciations. It was a time of sore trial to a man of such tender feelings as Macleod, who craved for sympathy, and was not indifferent to popular applause or censure.

> "I felt at first," he writes, "so utterly cut off from every Christian brother, that had a chimney-sweep given me his sooty band, and smiled on me with his black face, I would have welcomed his salute and blessed him. Men apologised for having been seen in my company. . . . Orators harangued against me in City Hall and Merchants' Hall. The empty drums rattled, and the brazen trumpets blew 'certain sounds' in every village. 'Leave the church,' 'Libel him,' were the brotherly advices given. . . . . Caricatures were displayed in every shop window."
>
> "This I wish to record," he writes afterwards in his journal, "that never, in my whole life, have I experienced so much real, deep sorrow—never so tasted the bitter cup of the enmity, suspicion, injustice and hate of the ministers and members of the Christian Church. Oh! it was awful. It gave me such an insight into the sufferings of Jesus from man's hate and suspicion (even though conscientiously entertained), such as I never before conceived of, and made me understand St. Paul and the Judaizers. But yet never in my life did I experience such deep peace, such real overwhelming joy. . . . I am naturally hot, ardent, vehement, satirical: but all this passed away,—may it keep away!"

The din and smoke of battle, in the course of time, naturally passed away, and it will now be acknowledged that Macleod did not throw back religious opinion as some at first said he had done, but that, besides clearing the way for more liberal and Christian views on the point in dispute, he had gained an important victory for liberty of opinion generally within the church. It was in this light that he himself viewed the effect of his action.

> "The smaller question," he writes, "is fast merging into the higher one of whether we are to gain a larger measure of ministerial liberty in interpreting those points in our Confession which do not touch the essentials of the Christian faith. . . . . I admitted, he says, that I had taught against the Confession of Faith, and no doubt that was the fact; but asserted that either all had done the same, or did not in every *iota* believe the Confession; therefore the question turned on whether I had so differed from the Confession as to necessitate deposition? I thus, at the risk of my ecclesiastical life, established the principle that all differences from the Confession, apart from the nature of the difference, did not involve deposition."

This question, which Macleod partially opened up, and to a certain extent solved, is one of extreme delicacy. That the Formula of Subscription which at present the ministers and elders of the Presbyterian Church are required to sign, must sooner or later be modified or altogether abolished, must be evident to all who know what a stumbling-block it is to many pious and able men, and how hurtful to the best interests of truth and spiritual life is the present system of even seemingly laying upon the office-bearers of the church the burden of a long and difficult Confession to which they must rigidly adhere, or else expose themselves to the risk of deposition. It will require, however, extreme delicacy of handling, together with all the charity, good sense, and wisdom which Presbyterians possess, to bring about the changes which the times seem to demand.

The last and crowning effort of Macleod's life was his visit to India. No better man could have been chosen to go on a missionary tour to our great Indian Empire, and no better companion could he have had than the large-hearted and able minister, Dr. Watson of Dundee, who accompanied him. His journey to and from India was a kind of triumphant march. Everywhere he was met with kindness and welcome, alike by Europeans and Hindoos, who could not resist the genuine earnestness, together with the wide, warm, sympathies which he displayed; and the greatest dignitaries were not slow to show him attention, and to afford every facility for the carrying out of his mission.

The fatigue and excitement of this visit to India were more than either body or mind seemed able to stand. He returned in shattered health to Scotland, but with wider views and with wider sympathies towards the human race. In Calcutta and Bombay he met with religions widely different from his own, and with modes of thinking strangely different from those of Europe. He was brought face to face with great questions which at mission meetings are often shirked or overlooked, and hurried though his journey necessarily was, he was yet able, through personal enquiry and examination of the schools and mission-stations which he visited, to form some idea of the real work done by missionaries, and of the best method by which the elevating and purifying spirit of Christianity might be communicated to our fellow subjects in India. Had the result of this visit been nothing more than the delivery of the admirable speech which Macleod made on his return, in which he gave an account to the General Assembly of what was doing in India, and expressed his views as to the prospects of missions and the possibility of Christianising that great country, his labour and suffering would not have been in vain. We do not think that his views were by any means thoroughly clear and mature, but the common sense, honesty, and manliness, combined with deep religious feeling, which he displ [illegible] handling of his subject, could not fail to elevate his brethren, and to exercise a wholesome influence on the religion of his church and of his country. No doubt he offended the prejudices of many, and his plain speaking on the question of what the future Church of India should be, must have been distasteful to not a few. But he made even those who were lukewarm or hostile to missions feel that there was something to be said in their favour, and that there were men in the church who, while full of missionary zeal, could yet speak and act with wisdom and moderation. Macleod's great idea was, that India was to be Christianised by means of an Education system principally, and not by what is called the simple preaching of the Gospel to unconverted, promiscuous crowds. The latter method he endeavoured to show was beset by innumerable practical difficulties, and, as a matter of fact, had been signally unsuccessful. "If you fairly consider such difficulties as these," he exclaimed, after showing the obstacles which lay in the way of reaching the Hindoo mind, "even you will also cease to wonder at the almost barren results from preaching alone to the genuine Hindoo, as distinct from low caste or no caste; and that the most earnest men have failed to make any decided impression on the mass, any more than the rain or light of heaven do on the solid works of a fortress." Through educational institutions he hoped that a native ministry would be raised up. "When India is Christianised it must be by her own people. We are strangers and foreigners, and, as far as we can discover, must ever be so. Nature decrees, 'Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further.'" He ventured further to tell his brethren that the future native Church which he desired to see established in India would not necessarily resemble the stereotyped forms of the Church in Europe, or be bound by the Confession of Faith or the Thirty-nine Articles. "If we could only get half-a-dozen truly able and enlightened Christian native preachers," he writes, "they would soon settle a creed for themselves." "When we get freedom at home as to the Subscription of Articles, we shall be better able to work freely in India. The chief difficulty in the way of advancing Christianity in India is unquestionably that almost all the missionaries represent a narrow one-sided Christianity."

A little more of this pious, and, at the same time, wise and generous spirit, animating our churches and missions, would soon win for them a measure of confidence and support which unfortunately they do not at present command, and would do more to "evangelise" the world than many a means at present adopted.

The last few years of Macleod's life have somewhat of sadness about them, indeed all throughout his life there is more or less an undertone of sadness. Pain and weakness at length bore him down, the deadness of the churches oppressed him at times, and his experience had been opening up to him great religious questions with which he had neither time nor strength thoroughly to grapple. Notwithstanding, to the last, he was the same active and earnest man. His influence, which for some time was sadly impaired by the "Sabbath controversy," was at last thoroughly regained. His church conferred upon him the highest honour which it had in its power to bestow, and elected him unanimously Moderator of the General Assembly. At the end of his career, as at the beginning, he took an active part in the movements connected with the Abolition of Patronage, and helped to carry through the measure which was lately adopted by the General Assembly, and sanctioned by Act of Parliament, for the total abolition of lay patronage in the Church of Scotland. Although the vigour of younger days had in some degree vanished, Macleod's character had become deeper, his sympathies wider, and his enthusiasm not abated, but tempered with greater knowledge of men and things. At length the inevitable end arrived, and on the 16th June, 1872, this good man passed to his rest amid the sincere sorrow of multitudes both at home and abroad.

We have said that Macleod was one of the greatest men whom Scotland has produced, and this is true, although at first sight it might appear to be an exaggerated estimate of his life and character. In no one thing did he specially excel. He is like one of those faces which we sometimes see, no single feature of which, when looked at critically, can be said to be perfect, and which yet, taken as a whole, we cannot help pronouncing beautiful, and more fascinating perhaps than many an one more correctly formed. There is often a light in the eye, an expression in the countenance, which is far more attractive than finely moulded features. It was the light and expression of Macleod's life which made him great. He was not a scholar. He was not a man of any strikingly developed intellectual power. He was not a great party leader. He was not even a great preacher or writer, looked at from the critic's point of view. But through everything which he said and did, there shone forth the light of a rich humanity, and that, too, notwithstanding the fact that he was a clergyman, whose profession is not always the most favourable to the development of breadth and honesty of character. As a minister, he was devoted, heart and soul, to his profession, although he disliked intensely the close ecclesiastical atmosphere which often surrounded him. "Could Isaac Walton," he pathetically writes, "be a member of a Scotch Presbytery or General Assembly? He who 'felt thankful for his food and raiment,' the rising and setting sun, the singing of larks, and leisure to go a-angling?" His sermons were often somewhat tawdry, and carelessly composed, but the earnestness and extreme naturalness of the man, together with the strong feeling which at times burst out in genuine eloquence, made him a powerful and attractive preacher, and drew around him especially the working classes in whose welfare he took such a deep interest. Preaching, which to some is a trick and a trade, and which popular election and the absurd demands made upon the modern preacher, have done so much to lower, was to him a delight and a reality. As a missionary, Norman Macleod was full of the "enthusiasm of humanity." He did not deliver a message merely, and give people a chance of being "converted," but he was himself the embodiment of a gospel to the poor. He sympathised with the wants and trials and temptations of those whom he addressed, and spoke to them as one of themselves. "The world, if ever it is to be reformed by men and through men," he said, "can only be so by the personal intercourse of living men, living epistles, not dead ones." He was warmly attached to the working classes, and sometimes pled their cause in words worthy of Carlyle. Speaking of the Chartists for instance in 1848, he says—

> "We demand from them patience while starving—do we meet their demands for bread? We demand from them obedience to law—do we teach them what they are to obey? We demand from them love of man—have we taught them the love of God? What is the nation to do for these men who made the nation anxious, and the exchange of the world oscillate—and the hero of a hundred fights put on his armour? . . . . . Put down! It is the putting down of a maniac, not his cure. . . . . . Special! What hast thou ever done for thy brother? Ay, don't stare at me or at thy baton—thy brother I say. Now don't get sulky; I am not ungrateful to thee, nor am I disposed to fraternise with Duffy and O'Connor, though I call Snug and Bottom brothers; but I ask, hast thou ever concerned thyself about thy poor brother?—how he was to be fed and clothed? or, if neither, how he was to endure? How he was to be taught his duties to God and man?—and if not, how he was to be a loyal subject to Queen Victoria, and a supporter of the Bench of Bishops?"

As a churchman, he was strongly attached to the Church of his Fathers, not merely because it was *his* church, but because he believed it to be an invaluable blessing to his country. He loved the Presbyterian form of Christian society, but he was not blind to the good which lies in other forms. As a theologian, Macleod would hardly satisfy the demands of rigid orthodoxy. By no means an original thinker, he had yet a mind and heart susceptible to every influence, and what others reached through intellect and study, he reached through observation and feeling. He could not preach what he could not make his own, and this honest inability led him, doubtless, to shrink from the use of much popular religious phraseology, and from many extreme statements of doctrine.

Latterly he thought and conversed much on the great religious questions of the day, and while extremely nervous lest Truth should be trifled with, he was ever open to hear in a patient, kind and intelligent manner what others might have to say. He became more and more impressed with the conviction that a great change was imminent in the theological world.

> "Nothing amazes or pains me more," he writes, "than the total absence of all pain, all anxiety, all sense of burden and difficulty among nine-tenths of the clergy I meet, as to questions which keep other men sleepless. Give me only a man who knows, who feels, who takes in, however feebly (like myself), the life and death problems which agitate the best (yes, the *best*), and most thoughtful among clergy and laity, who thinks and prays about them, who feels the difficulties which exist, who has faith in God that the right will come right, in God's way, if not in his, I am strengthened, comforted, and feel deeply thankful to be taught."

Again he writes—

> "I believe all our churches are breaking up; we have almost settled the questions of mere dogmatics. Calvinism, Arminianism, and all the *isms* connected with men have done their work in educating the church. . . . . . God forgive us clergy who have made men infidels, by all the 'hard speeches' we have in our ignorance uttered against Thee."

Macleod's great defect, as he himself admitted and lamented, was want of method, and a clear, well-trained mind. Good feeling and wide observation may sometimes supply the lack of accurate knowledge and diligent study; but at a time when grave questions, arising out of the critical, philosophical, and scientific studies of the age present themselves, it is only from well-stored, well-disciplined minds that we can expect a solution of them. Hence it was that while, under the influence of such men as Campbell, Stanley, and Maurice, Macleod broke away from popular theories of inspiration, atonement and eternal punishment, he never clearly saw perhaps the ground on which he himself was firmly standing. Hence, too, he was unfit to be the leader of that liberal party in the Church of Scotland, and indeed in all the Scottish churches, which is seeking to adapt old forms of government and theology to the necessities of the present day. While all his instincts were on the side of toleration and a wider creed, he was at times inclined to be hasty in his judgment of what was to be considered essential, and impatient of criticism and intellect.

As a writer of fiction, Norman Macleod ranks high in his own department. His stories are full of pathos, Scotch humour and piety, and display no little power of description and knowledge of human nature. No doubt as works of art they are defective, but there is a charm of reality about them which more artistic works often lack. He reminds us sometimes of George Macdonald, sometimes of Dickens. He revels in the enjoyment of Nature, and makes his readers feel as if they were boys again with himself, roaming through glens and woods, climbing the heathery hills, or fishing in Scottish "burn" or "loch." He knows where to touch chords of sympathy in human hearts, and can make us laugh and weep almost in the same moment, as he suddenly passes from the sublime to the ridiculous. Among his best known stories are "Wee Davie" and "The Starling." The latter, especially to those who are intimately acquainted with the language and customs of the humbler classes in Scotland, is extremely entertaining. It sparkles with wit and fun at the expense of religious cant and rabid Sabbatarianism, while at the same time it glows with human sympathy and tenderness. Jock Hall, the Sergeant, and the Minister, Mr. Smellie, and Mrs. Craigie, to say nothing of the Sabbath-breaking starling itself, are admirably described. It is often thought that the Scotch have little sense of humour. Those who think so should read Dean Ramsay's "Reminiscences" and the writings of Norman Macleod.

Macleod was not a poet, but he sometimes managed to write a good verse. Some of his humorous pieces, which he was in the habit of setting to music and singing himself, are among his happiest attempts at versification. "The Waggin' o' our Dog's Tail" and "The Curling Song" have sometimes almost a ring of Burns about them.

"It's an unco' like story, that baith Whig and Tory
  Maun aye collyshangy, like dogs owre a bane,
An' that a' denominations are wantin' in patience.
  For nae kirk will thole to let others alane;
But in fine frosty weather, let a' meet thegither,
  Wi' brooms in their hauns, an' a stane near the 'T.';
Then Ha! Ha! by my certies, ye'll see hoo a' parties
  Like brithers will love, and like brithers agree!
    Then hurrah for the curlin' frae Girvan to Stirling!
      Hurrah for the lads o' the besom and stane!
    Ready noo! Soop it up! Clap a guard! Steady noo!
      Oh! curlin' aboon a' the games stands alane."

In private circles Macleod was honored and loved by family and friends. Although so much of his time was spent in public, he was to the last a " domestic " man, and notwithstanding the honours which were heaped upon him by everyone, from Her Majesty downwards, he retained always something of the simplicity and naturalness of early days. He was a friend of children, and a sympathiser with all forms of suffering and distress. In society, he was extremely popular. His conversation overflowed with stories and jokes, as well as with more serious matter.

Taking him all in all, notwithstanding shortcomings and defects, which his friends will admit, and which his enemies were not slow to exaggerate, Norman Macleod was a great man, and his influence on the church and on his countrymen generally was of the most salutary nature. Scotland has reason to be proud of him, and the Church-Universal should rejoice to claim as one of her ministers such a liberal-minded, able, and devoted man. No more fitting epitaph could have been framed in memory of him than that which Royalty has caused to be inscribed on one of the stained windows placed in Crathie Parish Church, where he often preached in presence of his Sovereign :—

> "In memory of the Rev. Norman Macleod, D.D., Dean of the Most Noble and Most Ancient Order of the Thistle, Dean of the Chapel Royal, and one of Her Majesty's Chaplains : a man eminent in the Church, honored in the State, and in many lands greatly beloved."

CHARLES STRONG.

OPENING LETTERS IN THE POST OFFICE.

In June, 1844, at which time Sir Robert Peel's Ministry of 1841 had been nearly three years in office, Mr. Thomas Duncombe, the popular member for the borough of Finsbury, presented two petitions to the House of Commons, complaining that the petitioners' letters had been opened in the Post-office.

During the three weeks that followed the presentation of the petitions, no less than six or seven debates about them took place in the two Houses.

Mr. Duncombe began by saying that the law, as it stood, gave the petitioners no redress, and gave the Secretary of State power to open the letters, but he urged that the power ought to be abolished. He accused Sir James Graham of having exercised it most unscrupulously during the past two years, and odiously and unjustifiably in the petitioners' cases. Were, he exclaimed, the free subjects of a free state to submit to such a system? It was disgraceful to a free country that such a system should be tolerated. It might do in Russia, France, Austria, or Sardinia, but it did not suit the free air of this free country. Sir James Graham was guilty of both fraud and forgery.

Mr. Wallace, the member for Greenock, said that he had, year after year, while agitating for post-office reform, habitually accused governments of this practice. He believed that persons had been sent abroad to study in the school of Fouché, how to open, fold, and re-seal letters. He said that the power to open letters was given in the Act of Parliament, but he denied that it ought to be there. When franking was the privilege of members, he used to write on the outside of all his franks and letters, "Please to re-seal and forward this letter after you have read, and do not burn it."

Mr. Hume said, that in a free country like this, such a power ought not to exist. The moment a slave touched our soil, he was free. Were freemen to be made slaves by such a power? It was an outrage on public liberty.

Mr. Watson, the member for Kinsale, called the power an unconstitutional one.

Mr. Macaulay said that, as their attention had been called to the power, it could not without very great modification be permitted to last.

Mr. Sheil, the member for Dungarvon, said that what is deemed utterly scandalous in private life ought not to be tolerated in any department of the State; and that from the statute which it dishonors this ignominious prerogative ought to be effaced for ever.

Mr. Wakley said that surely nothing could be more contemptible and odious, or reflect more injuriously on the character of the Government and the country, than that such an odious practice should be tolerated.

In the House of Lords, Lord Brougham said that the power vested in the Secretary of State was one of the most odious description.

Lord Denman said that he could no more believe it necessary to show that such a power ought not to be vested in the discretion of any individual than he felt it necessary to argue that it was wrong to pick a pocket.

Lord Campbell said that it was clear that such a power could only be exercised under an Act of Parliament; for the common law gave the Secretary of State no such authority. Under the common law, letters were sacred. He had no hesitation in saying, after a careful examination of the Acts of Parliament, that to open, detain, and delay letters under a general warrant would be unlawful. The warrant must be an express one against a definite letter, or it would contravene the Act of Parliament. The security of their correspondence was a distinction of which the people of this country had ever been justly proud; and he trusted that that privilege they were not destined to lose. He admitted, what the Lord Chief Justice, Lord Denman, said, that both of them had taken a part in preparing the Post Office Act of 1837, which Act expressly acknowledged the existence of the Secretary of State's power, to direct the Postmaster-General and officers of the Post-office to open letters; but his conviction was that the Legislature only intended to give a power to the Government, in case it received information that a letter was passing through the Post-office, containing matter dangerous to the State, to order such letter to be opened. He believed that the Legislature never intended to give such power to any member of the Government.

Eight days afterwards, however, his lordship was far less confident in his laying down of the law. This, he now said, was a power which undoubtedly ought to remain vested under certain regulations, and to be exercised in great emergencies in the government of the country. Surely it was monstrous that, in a time of profound peace abroad, and when there was no appearance of domestic treason or disturbance, such a gross violation of private correspondence should take place. It appeared to him perfectly essential that the matter should not be allowed to rest in its present position. The character of the country had been compromised, and it was absolutely necessary to lose no time in wiping off the stain which the honour of England sustained, and to this end further inquiry was requisite.

Three days still later, his lordship told the House that he had just read the ordinance passed during Cromwell's protectorate, and it was quite clear that the Post-office Act of Anne was not intended to *grant* such an unconstitutional power as the issue of general warrants, for that Act required an express warrant for each letter.

Lord Lyndhurst, the Chancellor, corrected his Lordship's error in fancying that the Act of Anne had granted the power or created it. The power was already in existence when that Act was passed, and the Act did no more, said the Chancellor, than allude to the power. Moreover, his lordship's construction of the Act, that it required every warrant to specify the particular letter to be opened, was wrong.

Lord Brougham said that Lord Campbell's construction was "rank nonsense."

The Opposition leaders, to obtain the favour of that section of the country which supports them, affected to regard the power to open letters in the Post-office as an altogether novel invasion of freedom immemorially enjoyed; as a power unknown to the common law, instituted for the first time in Queen Anne's reign, and till then never heard of; as having even then been, by some unaccountable accident only, incautiously slipped into an Act of Parliament, where it had ever since lain hid, almost a dead letter; though it had been on rare occasions, furtively and with conscious shame, used by two or three Secretaries of State more than usually unscrupulous.

It is incredible that so many men of learning and official experience as were contained among the Opposition leaders in Parliament could have been as altogether ignorant of the long standing, the law, the practice, or the necessity of this power, as their speeches represented them to be.

The reason of their behaviour was their old policy of feeding the prejudices and exciting the passions of their supporters, most of whom were unable to inform themselves about the nature of the power, and unqualified, when informed by another, to form a just opinion of its importance or non-importance in carrying on the government of the country.

Everything that a Tory Government did, however reasonable it might look on its surface, ought to be suspected and opposed as a matter of course. There was ground for alarm here that a clear right of every free man was being insidiously destroyed. The more the rights of the propertied class, especially the landowners, were taken away, the better for the poor. These were the prejudices and passions to be played upon—blind hatred, fear and cupidity.

For three long weeks did both Houses suffer patiently the infliction of the Opposition eloquence. Perhaps the Houses hoped that some of the many lawyers, judicial and unjudicial, among them, would tell them what the law was. Not a single lawyer, however, enlightened the ignorance that certainly existed inside Parliament generally, as to the origin of the power in question. The speeches of the Duke of Wellington, of Lord Lyndhurst (the Chancellor), and of the other members of the Ministry who spoke, seem to show that clearly.

The Parliamentary system no more draws into Parliament the best informed of the lawyers than it draws there the best informed of the theologians, or of any other men of science. Though none but able men are made Chancellors, Attorneys and Solicitors-general, yet it is not by any means the best informed of the lawyers that obtain those high-sounding titles.

The Government firmly refused to give in public an atom of information about their exercise of the power: and they insisted upon having a thorough inquiry made into the past and present law and practice of opening letters in the Post-office.

Both Houses wanted information, not declamation. They, therefore, fell back upon their regular machinery for getting information from outside. Each House appointed a committee of inquiry.

The manly course taken by the Government turned out, as it happened, inconvenient to the Opposition. Soon after the committees commenced their inquiries, the Opposition learned that the law was being shown to be the very contrary to what they had exerted themselves to persuade the country that it was. Mr. Duncombe thereupon attempted to induce the House of Commons to alter the direction of their committee's inquiry. He said, contemptuously, that they did not want historical and antiquarian research. His attempt to interrupt the inquiry failed, however. The inquiry went on.

No sooner had the committees begun to sit than they were furnished with all the information they wanted. Some of it consisted of passages in manuscript records and State papers and printed reports of State trials. Before a single month had passed from the time of their being appointed, the committees made their reports and furnished the Houses with a valuable selection from the documentary information, occupying when printed 116 large pages.

The Post-office commenced to exist in Henry VII.'s reign. It was purposely attached and subjected to the office of the King's secretary. The importance of the latter office was then rapidly increasing. The performance of a variety of functions once performed by the Council, the Chancellor, or the Keeper of the Privy Seal, was being gradually committed to it. Before the keeper of the privy seal and his clerks were removed from the household, and established as a separate office, the King's Secretary was one of the many mere clerks of the household, and transacted the unimportant business only then done under the signet or the mere sign-manual; but after that event, he began the upward course which, in a couple of centuries, made him one of the chief officers of the State.

The Keeper of the Privy Seal had, in the fourteenth century, had gradually transferred to him much of that administrative and secretarial business which before then had been done by the Chancellor. In the fifteenth century, the Privy Seal's own turn to be superseded came, and the large business done by him was by degrees transferred to the secretary.

For a time after the removal of the privy seal office from the household, the Secretary had those letters and messages which he sent away, carried by the same household officers and servants as had carried the privy seal letters and other ordinary letters and messages of the King, or his family or household.

The ranks and classes of messengers, as they are generically called in the rolls relating to the household, were numerous. They comprised the dignified envoy to a Pope, an Emperor, or a King of France, and the poor Cockney who was sent with a parcel or on some small errand. Below the ranks of those employed on diplomatic, confidential, or ceremonial affairs, were the classes ordinarily made use of by the secretary. Of these ordinary messengers there was a certain class called "runners." They belonged to the Chamberlain's department. Some of them were footmen, others were mounted.

The origin of the Post-office was a change made by the Secretary. Some men not belonging to the Chamberlain's department were hired to act, under the immediate orders of the Secretary, as runners.

Over these men was placed a master, and the title of master of the messengers or runners was given to him.

Ever since the end of the Scotch Wars of the two first Edwards, a state of petty warfare had continued to exist on the Scotch border, and it had become chronic. Owing to this state of things despatches were always passing to and fro between the wardens of the Scotch Marches and the Court, wherever it might be residing.

The Secretary made a change by which the royal despatches could be carried quicker than before then between the court and the Scotch Marches. He stationed relays of runners, at posts on the road, waiting, ready to carry the despatches on without any stoppage. This system had, no doubt, been used in times of emergency, but it was now for the first time established permanently.

The men so employed acquired among the people the name of the King's Posts. From time to time, when a war arose or the Court went on a progress, a line of King's Posts would be stationed, temporarily only, along this or that route. The messengers so temporarily stationed were called Extraordinary or Court Posts, in distinction from the men stationed on the line to the Scotch Marches, who were called the Ordinary or Standing Posts.

It became common for the King's Posts to carry letters and parcels for merchants and other private men. They were allowed to do so, and to make profit of it. So great was the increase in the number of private men's letters carried, that it became more and more the interest of the Master of the Posts that standing Posts should be established on other routes than the Great North one.

The earliest lines of Standing Posts established after the Great North one, were, that between the Court and Holyhead on the way to Dublin, that between London and Dover, and that between London and Plymouth. Before these lines were turned into ordinary ones, they had been extraordinary ones kept on foot in war time only.

The new institution of the Posts was favored by the first Tudor —a prince, vigorous, provident, and always inventing measures for diminishing the frequency of rebellions, the greatest evil of the country before his days. In the hands of his secretary, sitting daily in the household and acting by his verbal instructions, the new institution would help more to prevent rebellion than the regular one of searching common carriers and travellers. It was the King's interest to get into his own hands all the letters that passed up and down the country.

The Government had always watched correspondence by letter. It had been especially vigilant in watching letters passing into the realm or out of it. A coast-guard had always been kept standing to search for letters. Its duty was to search for any letter suspected to be mischievous, whether to the King or to a mere subject; and to send it to the Council to be opened or otherwise dealt with as that body might determine.

The Council had been the chief organ of the discovering power. Some part of the discovering authority of the Council had been transferred to the Chancellor as parcel of that jurisdiction which was transferred from the Council to him, was called his extraordinary jurisdiction, and is that one of his many functions with which we all are most familiar at the present day. In cases of litigation between subject and subject, it is the Chancellor who gives the discovery. Another part of the same discovering authority of the Council has, since Richard II.'s day, been transferred to the justices of the peace. Some of the same extensive authority has been abolished, some is dormant only, some is still exercised regularly. In one class of cases, the inspection of writings, the discovering power began about the end of the fifteenth century to be exercised sometimes through the secretary, a non-judicial officer, and, on that very ground, one well fitted for its beneficial exercise in this particular class of cases.

There is extant a series of enrolments of the patent commissions of the masters of the posts from the year 1545 to the Commonwealth. The gifts of the office, before 1545, had probably been made by a sign-manual and signet or other unrecorded species of warrant. The change in the form of the commission is perhaps due to the growing readiness of the king's bench and common pleas, after the attainders and executions of Empson and Dudley, and the other parliamentary attacks at Henry VIII.'s accession upon executive Ministers, to pronounce acts of state unlawful; and to the hope of the King himself and the Postmaster, that a clause of monopoly granted under the great seal might fare better under the hands of those powerful courts than if granted under any less solemn warrant.

That the postal establishment was in 1516 under the Secretary's commands is shown by a still extant letter written in that year by one Brian Tuke, the then master of the posts, to Henry VIII.'s secretary, Thomas Cromwell.

Through the reigns of the Tudor princes and until the year 1640 a State monopoly of letter carrying was successfully maintained, its object being political not financial, for as late as the reorganization of 1635 the inland postal service cost the King £3400 a-year. The change of 1635 was an important one, and turned out so profitable that, according to Hume, eighteen years afterwards, the inland Post-office, instead of being a burden to Oliver Cromwell, was farmed for £10,000 a-year.

In 1640 the patentee of the inland and foreign Post-offices, Thomas Witherings by name, was accused of abuses. Thereupon his office was sequestrated by a proclamation on the 6th August of that year, and the sequestrator was commanded to execute the office under the oversight of the principal Secretaries of State. The active control of the Secretary's office was never allowed to be in abeyance. It was in daily exercise.

Soon after 1642 the Post-office was placed in the hands of Mr. Prideaux, who afterwards became Attorney-general of the Commonwealth. In 1644 he was appointed by both Houses master of the posts.

In 1646 the validity of the monopoly clause in Withering's patent was disputed before a committee of the House of Lords; and two judges reported to the committee that the monopoly was invalid, and that nothing but an Act of the Legislature could create it. This litigation lasted till 1650, and then the two Houses resolved that the offices of postmasters, inland and foreign, *are* and ought to be in the sole power and disposal of the Parliament.

Accordingly their nominees executed those offices, under their supervision, until 1655, and from then till the passing of the ordinance of 1657, John Thurloe, Cromwell's Secretary of State, executed them.

The vast number of letters intercepted in the Post-office, which is printed in the Thurloe State papers, alone shows the generality and regularity of the practice before and during the Cromwellian rule. Had the practice of opening letters in the Post-office not been of old standing, legal, and in the opinion of all men expedient and reasonable, Cromwell would assuredly have been accused by the royalists of it. Birch first published copies of these intercepted letters in 1741, more than eighty years after Cromwell's death; but no one then, any more than before, was silly enough to accuse Cromwell of being the inventor of a practice, at once illegal and deserving the epithets used by the Opposition of 1844.

The frame of Cromwell's Post-office ordinance deserves attention. Its preamble says:—" Whereas it hath been found by *experience* that the erecting and settling of *one* General Post-office for the speedy conveying, carrying and recarrying of letters by post to and from all places within England, Scotland and Ireland, and into several parts beyond the seas *hath been* and is the *best means*, not only to maintain a certain and constant intercourse of trade and commerce betwixt all the said places, to the great benefit of the people of these nations, but also to convey the public despatches and *to discover* and prevent many dangerous and wicked designs which have been and are daily contrived against the peace and welfare of this Commonwealth, the intelligence whereof *cannot well be communicated* but by letter of escript." It then enacts a monopoly. It does not enact that the Protector or any officer of the Commonwealth may open a letter, although the preamble says that the grand object of the new law was to discover designs against the peace and welfare of the government.

It is obvious that Cromwell's lawyers knew that the power to open letters in the Post-office was unquestionable; but that the power to monopolise the carrying of them was at least doubtful. Though Cromwell, in all his power, found it necessary to get a law made creating the monopoly, it was not necessary for him, and it would have been foolish, to have a law made to create what every lawyer knew to be a perfectly lawful power already vested in the Protector, as being depositary of the prerogatives.

It was, moreover, because no lawyer of the seventeenth century had any doubt of the royal power to open letters that the two Houses continually, during the civil war and Commonwealth, ordered the mails to be stopped, and appointed committees to open and read the letters.

The restoration took place in May, 1660. In the following August Charles farmed the Post-office for seven years at £21,500 a year to Henry Bishop, under the title of master of the running messengers. In the following December, a Post-office Act of Parliament, substantially a copy of Cromwell's ordinance, was passed. In 1663 Bishop surrendered his grant; a new grant issued to O'Neale, a groom of the chamber; and an Act of Parliament settled the post office profit on the Duke of York.

The enrolments of Bishop's and O'Neale's agreements are still extant. Each of those postmasters covenants with the King to permit the Secretaries of State for the time being, or either of them, from time to time, and at all times during the term, to have the survey and inspection of all letters within the office, at their or either of their discretion.

The very language of these covenants shows that the survey and inspection of letters was so well established a practice as not to require any explanation or description in the indentures. There cannot be a doubt of the covenant having been a standing one. Everything done on the restoration, carefully pursued the precedents before Charles I.'s civil wars. The covenants, moreover, show that the regular practice was that the Secretaries of State opened letters at discretion.

The absence in Charles's Post-office Act of 1663, of any section giving a power to open letters, shows that Charles's lawyers had no misgiving as to the lawfulness of the practice, any more than Cromwell's lawyers had had.

It had, for more than a century certainly, been the regular practice to issue a proclamation, whenever a new post-master was appointed. In 1663, on the appointment of O'Neale, an unusual clause was inserted in the proclamation. That clause bears emphatic testimony to the notoriety of the practice of opening letters in the Post-office, and not only of the practice, but of the every-day exercise of it. The clause is: "And we do further charge and command, that no post-masters or other officers that shall be employed in the conveying of letters, or distributing of the same, or any other person or persons of quality or condition soever they be, except by the immediate warrant of our principal Secretaries of State, shall presume to open any letters or packets not directed unto themselves, or that they or any other persons whatsoever, do stop any mayl in the passage to or from London, or any other place whither the same is consigned and directed, but shall truly and faithfully deliver the same, without any opening concealing or retarding the delivery thereof." The same clause was inserted in the proclamations of 1667, 1669, 1683, and 1685.

It is obvious that these proclamations do not in the least restrain the prerogative. They show that the ordinary practice had been, for many royal officers to open letters, without having had any permission to do so given to them by the secretary. The secretary was, by no means, the only officer by whose agency the King could open a letter. Charles thought it expedient to forbid any servant of his to open a letter without his secretary's warrant, but that prohibition did not affect the King's own power to appoint whom he thought fittest to perform the duty.

In 1679, between the third and fourth of these five proclamations, the unfortunate Edward Coleman was tried, convicted, and executed for conspiracy in the popish plot. A part of the evidence upon which he was convicted was that his letters had been opened in the Post-office. Those letters of his were produced in court by the post-office officials. The trial excited the greatest possible attention throughout the country, and brought the practice of opening letters prominently before the public.

In the year 1709, the statute so often referred to in the debates of 1844, viz., the 9th Anne, c. 10, was passed. So far from this Act giving, as Lords Campbell and Denman said it did, a power to open letters in the Post-office, it does nothing of the sort. Anne's lawyers no more dreamt of doing such a thing than Cromwell's or Charles's had, when they framed the ordinance of 1657, and the Act of 1663. Nor does Anne's Post-office Act restrain the prerogative. It does not profess either to do so or to be intended to do so. All it does, or professes to do, is to declare with precision the limits of the power of opening letters possessed by the Postmaster-General and his subordinates. It forbids them, but no other person, from opening letters except in certain cases. One of the cases is when they have a Secretary of State's warrant.

Anne's Act does not give the secretary power to issue such a warrant. He had it by the common law; that is to say, the Queen had it, and she exercised her prerogative through him.

A part of the report of the Commons Committee of 1844 is as follows:—"Your Committee now come to the period subsequent to the passing of the 9th of Anne, the first statute which recognised the practice of opening letters, now under consideration.

Before they proceed to avail themselves of the information laid before them, which has proved to them that the 40th and 41st sections of this Act did not remain a dead letter, they will notice several occasions in the last century by which, both in Parliament and in courts of judicature, this practice was brought distinctly under public attention.

About eleven years after the passing of the Act, viz., in the year 1722-3, in the course of the proceedings had on passing the bills of pains and penalties against the Bishop of Rochester and his two associates, Kelly and Plunket, the principal evidence adduced against the parties accused was that of Post-office clerks and others, who, in obedience to warrants from the Secretary of State, had detained, opened, copied, and deciphered letters to or from those parties. In the committee on the bill against Atterbury, in the House of Peers, the clause of the statute of Anne was referred to and commented on by the Bishop's counsel, who raised a doubt whether the copying of a letter were sanctioned by the Act; but in no one of these three cases was any question raised as to the legality of the warrants.

In 1735, complaint being made in the House of Commons, by certain of the members, that their letters had been opened and read by the clerks of the Post-office, on the pretence of ascertaining whether or no the franks of those members were counterfeited, and a copy of his Majesty's warrant, whereby letters of members and certain public functionaries were permitted to pass free from postage, being read, it was ordered that the copy of the said warrant be referred to the consideration of a committee, and that they do examine the matter thereof and report the same, with their opinions thereon, to the House: and on the committee making its report, the House resolved, *inter alia*, "That it is a high infringement of the privilege of the knights, citizens, and burgesses, chosen to represent the Commons of Great Britain in Parliament, for any postmaster, his deputies, or agents, in Great Britain or Ireland, to open or look into, by any means whatever, any letter directed to or signed by the proper hand of any member, without an express warrant in writing, under the hand of one of the principal Secretaries of State, for every such opening and looking into; or to detain or delay any any letter directed to or signed with the name of any member, unless there shall be good reason to suspect some counterfeit of it, without any express warrant of a principal Secretary of State, as aforesaid, for every such detaining or delaying."

Sir Robert Walpole and Mr. Pelham are said to have agreed to the appointment of this committee, on an understanding that it should not inquire into anything that might tend to discover the secrets of Government. In 1742, however, the secrets of Sir Robert Walpole's Government were somewhat rudely pryed into by the select committee appointed "to inquire into the conduct of the Earl of Orford during the last ten years of his being First Lord of the Treasury, and Chancellor and Under-Treasurer of his Majesty's Exchequer."

That committee, in its report, gave a description of the establishment for inspecting letters, as maintained by the Government over which Sir Robert Walpole had presided; but abstained from stating on what particular occasions that establishment had been made available.

It appears from the information laid before your committee that under the pressure of the rebellion of 1745, which followed almost immediately on the downfall of the Administration of Sir Robert Walpole, his successors issued warrants for stopping and opening post letters of a very general and unlimited character.

In the year 1758, Dr. Hensey, a physician, was tried on a charge of high treason, being accused of treasonable correspondence with the enemy. The principal evidence on which he was convicted was that of a letter carrier and a post-office clerk, the latter of whom had opened Dr. Hensey's letters, and delivered them to the Secretary of State.

In 1764, a select committee of the House was appointed to inquire into the abuses of franking letters; and the chairman, Mr. Dyson, was directed by the committee to move the House, "That it be an instruction to the committee, that they have power to inquire into the abuses committed at the Post-office by opening inland letters;" the motion, however, was negatived.

The last instance that has come to the knowledge of your committee, in which this power was exercised under circumstances of public notoriety, is that of the trial of Horne Tooke for high treason in 1795. A letter written to him by Mr. Joyce, a printer, was intercepted at the Post-office, and was stated by the prisoner to have been the immediate occasion of his apprehension. On his requiring its production, it was produced in court by the Crown officers, and given in evidence.

It is now so long since any public trial has taken place, in which facts ascertained by opening and detaining letters at the Post-office have been adduced in evidence, that it seems to have been nearly forgotten by the public that such a practice ever existed.

Your committee having gone through the proofs of a more public character, that the Governments of past times have authorised the detaining and opening of post letters, and given notoriety to the exercise of that authority, and that the fact has, on several occasions, been brought under the notice of Parliament and courts of law, proceed now to show (from evidence of a more secret and confidential nature) to what extent this practice has been carried on, by the same authority, during the past and present centuries. Before entering, however, on this head of enquiry, they consider it proper to observe, that they have had before them, with a few exceptions, every person now living who has held the seals of Secretary of State for Home or Foreign Affairs, since the year 1822, as well as two noblemen who have discharged the office of Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland; and several persons who have held confidential situations under them: and they have further examined the present Postmaster-General, the secretaries of the Post-office for England and Ireland, together with several of the most confidential officers in every branch of the Foreign-office, the Home-office, and the Post-office; and that all these witnesses, without exception, have made to your committee the most full and unreserved disclosures; so much so as to have rendered it superfluous for your committee to examine any other witnesses.

Of the number and nature of warrants for opening and detaining post letters issued by Secretaries of State, from the year 1712 to the year 1798 inclusive, your committee are able to render only a very incomplete account, compiled partly from the books of the Home Department, partly from records at the State Paper-office. It appears that, during that term of years, it was not the practice to record such warrants regularly in any official book.

That this account is what the committee describe it to be, very incomplete, is manifest from the small number of warrants that enter into it, considering the length of the term of years. From 1712 to 1798 inclusive, a term of 87 years, the number of warrants, of which any account has been obtained, is but 101; and of that number 11 only belong to the last twenty eventful years of the term, including the period of the French Revolution. In this account, moreover, certain cases are not included, in which it is known, from reports of public trials and other independent sources of evidence, that letters were opened and detained, such as those of Atterbury, Plunket, Kelly, Hensey, and Horne Tooke.

From the commencement of the present century, if not from an earlier period, down to the present time, the practice has been, with very few exceptions, for such warrants to issue only from the Home Office, although another Secretary of State has occasionally signed the warrant in the absence of the Secretary of State for the Home Department.

From 1799 inclusive to the end of the year 1805 a record has been preserved of the warrants issued from the Home-office, which from the circumstance that the annual average which it exhibits agrees nearly with the annual average of the warrants issued in subsequent years, appears to the committee to be nearly a complete record; they have, however, no other mode of testing its accuracy. It was not until the period, in the year 1806, when the late Earl Spencer became Secretary of State for Home Affairs, that the practice was introduced at the Home-office of recording the issuing of every such warrant in a private book belonging, not to the head of the department, but to the office, and always accessible to the two Under-Secretaries of State and the chief clerk of the domestic department, and that practice has been continued, the committee believe, without interruption, till the present time. Still, there is no check by which to test the completeness of the entries made in that book until the close of the year 1822, from which period the original warrants themselves are preserved in the Post-office: the earlier warrants having been destroyed on the removal of the Post-office from Lombard-street to its present site in St. Martin's-le-grand.

After these explanations of the authenticity of the lists which have been submitted to their consideration, they proceed to give, first, an abstract of the warrants, so far as they have been able to make up an account, from 1712 to 1788 inclusive; secondly, an abstract of the warrants for detaining and opening letters, issued by the Home department from the commencement of the year 1799 to midsummer 1844.

Annual Number of Warrants in each year, from 1712 to 1798, so far as an account of the same could be made up:—

Year.	Number of Warrants.	Year.	Number of Warrants.	Year.	Number of Warrants.
1712	1	1744	3	1768	1
1713	2	1745	7	1770	3
1723	1	1746	1	1772	1
1730	1	1749	1	1773	1
1731	2	1751	1	1774	2
1734	3	1752	1	1776	1
1735	4	1753	6	1777	2
1736	3	1754	1	1778	2
1737	3	1755	1	1782	3
1738	7	1756	1	1783	1
1739	5	1763	3	1784	1
1740	1	1764	1	From 1788 to 1798	6
1741	4	1765	1		
1742	2	1766	4		
1743	4	1767	2	Total No. ...	101

The above Warrants classed under certain heads:—

Bank of England	8
Bankruptcy	5
Murder, Theft, Fraud, &c.	14
Prisoners of War	1
Revenue	10
Foreign Correspondence	35
Treason, Sedition, &c....	5
Libel	2
Forgery	1
Debtors absconding from Creditors	2
Private Cases	1
Uncertain	17
Total	101

Annual number of Warrants in each year, from 1799 to 1844:—

Years.	Number.	Years.	Number.	Years.	Number.
1799	9	1815	2	1831	17
1800	11	1816	0	1832	5
1801	7	1817	11	1833	4
1802	6	1818	9	1834	6
1803	7	1819	6	1835	7
1804	2	1820	6	1836	7
1805	7	1821	1	1837	4
1806	9	1822	12	1838	8
1807	13	1823	7	1839	16
1808	2	1824	2	1840	7
1809	11	1825	6	1841	18
1810	6	1826	8	1842	20
1811	8	1827	8	1843	8
1812	28	1828	4	1844	7
1813	8	1829	5		
1814	3	1830	14		372

Total number of Persons named in the above Warrants ... 724.

This would give a little more than eight warrants, on the average, per year, and about two persons, on the average, for each warrant. Among the warrants there are eight, applied each to some particular object, but not restricted to any definite number of persons.

The above warrants classed under certain heads:—

Bank of England	13
Bankruptcy	2
Murder, Theft, Fraud, &c.	144
Treason, Sedition, &c.	77
Prisoners of War	13
Revenue	5
Foreign Correspondence	20
Letters returned to Writers	7
Address Copied	1
Forged Frank	1
Uncertain	89
Total	372

The Secretaries of State who have signed the warrants referred to in the two preceding abstracts are named in the following list, arranged in the order of date:—

1712–13	The Earl of Dartmouth.
1713	The Right Hon. W. Bromley.
1722	Lord Viscount Townshend.
1733–46	Lord Harrington.
1735–54	Duke of Newcastle.
1749	Duke of Bedford.
1752–53	The Earl of Holderness.
1755	The Right Hon. Sir T. Robinson.
1756	The Right Hon. H. Fox.
1763	The Earl of Halifax.
1765–67	The Right Hon. General Conway.
1766	Duke of Richmond.
1766–67	The Earl of Shelburne.
1770	The Earl of Sandwich.
1770–74	The Earl of Rochefort.

1776–77	Lord Viscount Weymouth.
1778	The Earl of Suffolk.
1782–83	The Right Hon. T. Townshend.
1782	The Right Hon. C. J. Fox.
1784	Marquis of Carmarthen.
1799–1801	Duke of Portland.
1801–3	Lord Pelham.
1803	Right Hon. Charles Yorke.
1804–6	Lord Hawkesbury, and 1807-9.
1806–7	Earl Spencer.
1807	Right Hon. C. W. W. Wynn.
1809–12	The Right Hon. R. Ryder.
1812–21	Lord Viscount Sidmouth.
1822–30	The Right Hon. Sir R. Peel.
1822–23	Right Hon. G. Canning.
1823	Earl Bathurst.
1827	Lord Viscount Goderich.
1827	Right Hon. W. Sturges Bourne.
1827	Marquis of Lansdowne.
1830–34	Lord Viscount Melbourne.
1833–40	Lord Palmerston.
1834	Lord Viscount Duncannon.
1834	Duke of Wellington.
1834–35	Right Hon. H. Goulburn.
1835–39	Lord John Russell.
1838	Lord Glenelg.
1839-41	The Marquis of Normanby.
1841–44	The Right Hon. Sir James Graham.
1844	Earl of Aberdeen."

The committee then give particulars of some of the warrants of the last century that were issued on grounds which, they say, would now be considered highly objectionable, and would not be sanctioned by recent practice; of other warrants of the present century, both during and after the great war, of a very general nature; of some warrants issued in 1842 and 1843, during the disturbances in the manufacturing and mining districts and in South Wales; and of certain warrants issued during 1844, a short time before the appointment of the committee, to open the letters of Messrs. Mazzini, Worrell, Stolzmann, and Grodicki, and another foreign gentleman.

They moreover describe, with a good deal of detail, the practice in the Secretary of State's Office, on an application by the prosecutor of a criminal charge, for a warrant to open a letter.

A glance at the committee's table of classification of the warrants issued during the five and forty years next before their inquiry, shows that of the 283 warrants whose objects they had succeeded in ascertaining, no more than 77 were for treason or sedition, if so many, and that more than 200 were for discovery in ordinary cases of crime or fraud. So that in matters touching the State directly, no more than one or two in each year had been issued, and in matters concerning the subject rather than the State, no more than four or five in each year, had been issued. This looks as if the

Secretary of State's Office severely scrutinised all applications for these warrants, and carefully guarded against any abuse of the power.

The same table classes five of the 283 warrants under a head of revenue. As nothing had been said during the debates on letter opening about warrants of this class, the committees do not give any information about these five warrants.

In the August and September of 1842, two years before, sinister rumours of frauds on the customs' revenue, and of bribery and corruption in the London Custom-house had been rife. Government had appointed a commission of inquiry. The commissioners had taken a great deal of evidence, and found that an organised system of fraud upon the customs' revenue had been in work for years, and that the revenue had been defrauded of millions sterling. Government had instituted prosecutions against many persons suspected of being implicated in the frauds. The commissioners of revenue inquiry's minutes of evidence had been presented to the House of Commons on the 12th of June, 1844; two days only before Mr. Duncombe presented to that House the first of the two petitions complaining of letter opening.

The committees on letter opening do not, however, say whether or not any one of the five warrants they class under the head of revenue had been issued to the commissioners of revenue inquiry, or to the commissioners of customs, for the purpose of discovery in relation to the frauds then being prosecuted for. The information is in the Home-office and the Post-office, and within the knowledge of the agents employed to unravel the frauds and prosecute for them.

The power of opening a letter in the post-office is a prerogative of the Crown. It exists by virtue of the common law. No statute has given it. What the post-office statutes of the two Queens have done is to enumerate all the cases in which the Postmaster-general and his subordinates may open a letter of their own authority, without a Secretary of State's warrant. The acts do not limit the Secretary of State's discretion in exercising the power. They neither express nor imply an intention of making him the only Minister through whom the power may be exercised. Nor, apart from any question of intention, do they necessarily cause that effect. They do no more than regulate the practice of opening in cases where the post-office is the place in which the Secretary of State directs the opening to be made. They do no more than Charles II.'s proclamation did; the only difference between them and the proclamation being that Parliament alone can repeal the Acts, whereas the Crown of itself could call in the proclamation. The Acts are for the prevention of abuses by the officials of the post-office only, not of abuses by any other Ministers of the Crown. Parliament has neither had occasion nor thought fit to legislate against abuses in opening letters by Ministers outside the Post-office. The Post-office Acts neither limit the prerogative in fact, nor profess to do so. It is not in the least against the prerogative that they are directed. Their purview is in an altogether different direction.

The committees' reports and selections of evidence showed the sound policy of the power itself being lodged in the Crown, the sound discretion with which it had been exercised, the absence of any reason for transferring its exercise from the Secretary of State's office to any other Government department, judicial or administerial.

The two Houses saw that both the law and the practice were good, and that the uproar made by the Opposition had been groundless. The Opposition had not a word to say. Their scheme had endangered their own reputation as statesmen, lawyers, politicians, and even as men of good sense. They were glad to have the subject dropped and forgotten.

The law and the practice remain unaltered. It is a good thing for the country that the firm plain-dealing of Sir Robert Peel's Tory Ministry prevented the Liberals' pernicious habit of exciting popular folly, from destroying or maiming an institution of great value for preventing and avenging, not only offences against the sovereign's person, crown, dignity, peace, and revenue, not only murder and other offences with violence against the subject, but the less heinous offences against the subject of theft and fraud in many shapes, whether the subjects to be aided form a body of almost national importance, like the Bank of England, or be the humblest man or woman in the realm.

THOS D. M'DOUGAL.

MUTE DISCOURSE.

"Fulmina . . . cœlo nulla sereno."—Lucretius.

God speaks by silence. Voice-dividing man,
Who cannot triumph but he saith, Aha—
Who cannot suffer without, Woe is me—
Who, ere obedience follow on the will,
Must say, Thou shalt—who, looking back, saith Then,
And forward, Then; and feebly nameth, Now
His changing foothold 'twixt eternities;
Whose love is pain until it finds a voice—
Whose seething anger bubbles in a curse—
Who summarises truth in party-cries,
And bounds the universe with category.
This word-dividing, speech-preëminent man,
Deeming his Maker even as himself,
Must find him in a voice ere he believe.
We fret at silence, and our turbulent hearts
Say, "If He be a God He will speak out."
We rail at silence, and would fain disturb
The duly ordered course of signless years.
We moan at silence, till our quivering need
Becomes incarnate, and our sore desire
Passes into a voice. Then say we, "Lo,
He is, for He hath spoken; thus and thus
He said."
So ever radiating self,
Conditioning a God to our degree,
We make a word the top of argument—
Fond weaklings we, whose utmost scope and goal
Is but a pillared formula whereon
To hang the garlands of our faith and love.
Well was it in the childhood of the world
To cry for open vision and a voice:
But in the riper time, when we have reached
The kindly heart of universal law,
And safe assurance of essential good,
Say, rather, now that had there been *no* God,
There had been *many* voices, freaks of sound,

Capricious thunders in unclouded skies,
Portentous utterance on the trembling hills
And Pythian antics in oracular caves—
Yea, signs and wonders had been multiplied,
And god succeeded god, the latest ever
Lord-paramount, until the crazèd world
Had lost its judgment 'mid contending claims.
Oh men! It is the child's heart in the man's
That will not rest without a lullaby—
That will not trust the everlasting arm
Unless it hear the voice in tale or song.
It is the child's heart in the man's that seeks,
In elements of old Semitic thought,
And wondrous syllables of Grecian tongue,
Recorded witness of another way
Of things than that which God hath willed to be
Our daily life. And if in times of old
The child-heart caught at wonder, and the charm
Of sundered system—if untutored faith
Found confirmation in arrested suns,
And gaps in time with backward-driven degrees,
And in the agonised Thus saith the Lord
Of mantled seers with fateful burden bowed—
We, children of a clearer, purer light
(Despising not the day of smaller things,
Nor calling out to kick the ladder foot
Because our finger tips have verged on rest)—
We, youths, whose spring brings on the lawful hope
To loose the girdle of the maiden, Truth.
We, men, whose joyous summer morn hath heard
The marriage bell of Reason and of Faith—
We, turning from the windy ways of the world,
And gazing nearly on the silent march
Of love in law, and law in love, proclaim
"In that He works in silence He is God!"
So, from the very permanence of things,
And voiceless continuity of love,
Unmixed with human passion, fretted not
By jealousy, impatience, or revenge,
We gather courage, and confirm our faith.
So, casting back the scoffer's words, we say,

Even because there is no fitful sign,
And since our fathers fell asleep all things
Continue as at first—this wonder of no change
Reputes the God, to whom a thousand years
Are as one day. Yea, to the willing ear,
The dumb supremacy of patience speaks
Louder than Sinai. And if yet we lack
The witness and the voucher of a voice,
What hindereth that we who stand between
The living Nature and the living God,
Between them, yet in both—their ministers—
By noble life and converse pure, should be
Ourselves the very voice of God on earth,
Living epistles, known and read of all!
  Oh brothers! Were we wholly soul-possessed
With this divine regard—would we but soar
Beyond the cloud, and centralise our faith
Upon the stable sun—would we reject
Kaleidoscopic views of broken truth
Distorted to the turn of perverse will—
Make daylight through traditionary ranks
Of intervening hells, and fix the eye
Upon the shining heart of Supreme Love.
Would we . . . But why prolong the bootless would?—
I, who know all the weakness and the fear,
The weary ways of labyrinthine doubt,
The faintness on the dizzy height—who lack
The Gabriel-pinion wherewithal to range
The unsupporting medium of pure sky—
Who know the struggle of the natural soul,
Breathing a finer ether than its own—
Who, venturing on specular power too vast,
Scorched by my own reflector, fall down blind;
Who, at the least wind of calamity,
Drag shiftlessly the anchor of my hope,
And, shrieking from the waves, catch gladly at
A Name and Sake wherewith to close a prayer!
  Yet though I faint and fail, I may not take
My weakness for the Truth, nor dare misread
The manual sign of God upon the heart,
The pledge, beyond the power of any voice,

Of sure advance unto the perfect whole;
Nor treat the tablet-tracing of His hand
As it were some old tombstone left apart
In grave-yard places for the years to hide
Deep in irrelevant and noxious growth.
Oh, Brothers! push the weeds aside, lay bare
The monument, and clear the earthy mould
From the Divine intaglio. Read thereon
The uncancelled charter of your native hope,
Nor crave articulate thunders any more.
Read there the universal law of good;
Unqualified evangel; blessedness,
The birthright of all being; peace, that lends
No weak subscription unto sin, and yet
Disarms despair. Read, and believe no more
In final triumph of concreted sin
In any soul that cometh forth from God,
And lives, and moves, and hath its being in Him.
Read thus, and pray the while that he who writes
Reck his own rede.
Oh, Sister! would I bruise
The snowy petals of thy prayerful faith,
Or chill the tendril-twinings of thy hope
With evil influence of wintry scorn?
Would God that any faith of mine could give
Such quiet stability unto my feet
As thine to thine! Oh, if thy kneeling wakes
A smile at all, 'tis heaven that smiles because
Thou ask'st so little! God will o'erfulfil
Thy dreams of silver with unmeted gold.
Oh, Sister, though thou dost believe in wrath,
Though shapes of woe flit through thine imagery,
Though thou hast ta'en the cloud into thy faith,
Thy little rift of blue that breaks the dark
Brings thee more comfort and more fixèd hope
Than unto me this cloudless open vast
Wherein my soul floats weary and alone!
Yet think not we are voyaging apart,
To different havens. Truth is one. Yet One
Alone hath reached it in straight course. Each soul
Hath its own track, its currents, and its gales;

And each toward sequel of attainment must
Fetch many a compass. Some keep land in view—
The beacon-hills of old authority—
And draw assurance from a shore defined,
Though it be dire with cloud, and capes of wrath;
While some shoot boldly into perilous seas—
Pacific seeming seas, yet not without
A weary loneliness of land forsook,
And fear of sudden cyclone, and still more
Deceitful calm. Or, if the metaphor
Be yet too cruel for a sister's heart,
Oh, think that in the common way of love
We are never out of hearing; but may each,
Whene'er we will, join hand with each, and say,
"God—Father—Love," the triune sum of Truth,
And Watchword of the universal Christ.
  Sister, I think, and in the thought take heart,
That when the Day of Reconcilement comes,
As come it will, the all-transmuting Truth
May find affinities in things that seem
To us the very elements of war.
  Dost thou remember how in childhood's days,
One gave us wit to recognise the south
By turning faceward to the mid-day sun;
And we believed, and took the facile plan
For unexceptioned law? But even now
I hear the chime of Austral noon, and, lo,
The sun is in the north! Yet 'tis the same
Bright sun that shone and shines upon us both,
On me the evil, and on thee the good:
Yea, more, it is the same, noon-glaring here,
That now with hints of orient twilight steals
Over the stillness of thy morning dreams.
  Dost thou remember how in those old days,
The dear old days that ne'er may come again—
Though love, like history, repeats itself,
But with the larger feature, stronger hand,
And keener sense, evoked of common grief—
When we would scan the circling mountain-cope
That made our little valley all a world,
One taught our young unlearnèd lips to say,

"The Sensible Horizon;" then dissolved
Our bounded dream, and showed our widening minds
That this was not the limit of the truth,
But grew from our own petty finitude; and far
In unconceived remote another line,
Yet only in concession named a line,
"The Rational," made space intelligible,
And gave relations to the stars. Yet not
The less our early, mountain-narrowed sky
Was still *the* sky to us, cloud, storm, and all.
Oh take my parable, and fondly think
That though the years have brought me wider range,
And shifting zeniths been my law of life,
Did you and I yet tread the native vale,
I not the less, beneath that homely sky,
Would point to it whene'er we spoke of heaven.
Oh bear my parable; and if it be
Within permitted bounds of reverence
To round a solemn theme with gentle jest,
The mingling import of familiar words
May bridge our difference, since in daily speech
The sensible and rational are one.

J. Brunton Stephens.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM.

[As Parliament is shortly about to assemble, and as the Government has announced its intention of bringing in an Electoral Bill, the conductors of this *Review* believe they will be consulting the wishes of their readers by inserting the following article on Parliamentary Reform, in place of the usual article on Public Affairs. They may state that it is written by a gentleman than whom no one is entitled to speak with greater authority on such a subject.]

SIR James M'Culloch has promised us some Parliamentary reform. There is at present a lull in the political feeling on the subject which affords a rare opportunity for placing it on a scientific basis, and in that aspect we propose to consider it.

Universal suffrage, whatever we may think of it, must be regarded and dealt with as an acknowledged and accomplished fact. *Vestigia nulla retrorsum,* is almost invariably true of legislation. No reform can ignore our Manhood Suffrage. On the contrary, any reform to be permanent must give full effect to it, and the legislator, looking it boldly in the face, must analyse it and discover its object; ascertain whether that object is effected; and if not, must supply what is necessary to bring about the intended result.

There can, we apprehend, be no doubt but that Manhood or Universal Suffrage is based on the axiom that all men are politically equal, and that no man ought to possess more civil privileges than his neighbour. Let us see whether it secures those objects, for if it does not, it must be at fault.

The true theory of making laws is that the whole community meet together to make them; and the will of the majority, *after hearing the arguments and objections of the minority, becomes the law.* The non-recognition of this maxim that, "both sides must be heard," will be found to be the blot which defaces our electoral system.

As it is practically impossible, in a large community, for all the people to meet together in person, they do so by deputy—whether by means of representatives or delegates, is not material to the question; and it is a self-evident proposition that unless every member of the community has an opportunity of being heard, either in person or by deputy, *when the laws are made,* he has practically no voice in law-making.

Taking it, then, for granted, that *every* elector has a right to be heard at the time of making the laws, and bearing in mind the fact that he cannot be present in person because the population is too large, the first question we have to consider is, whether he is present by deputy? Has he, in short, any person to act for and represent him in the Legislature? We answer unhesitatingly—No.

A man cannot be said to be represented in any meeting or assembly unless there be present some person whom he has freely chosen for that purpose. It is, of course, conceded that the majority must govern; and they, no doubt, do govern at the present time. But they govern at the wrong place, and on the wrong occasion. They govern—not in the Legislature, but at the hustings; they govern "without hearing the other side," and they consequently govern inequitably.

Suppose the majority of a legislative body—it may be only a majority of one—had made up their minds to pass a certain law, and having so made up their minds were to go down to the House, and say, "We will hear no objections; the majority must govern; we are a majority, and we will make this law"—would not everybody denounce such an act of tyranny at once? And yet that is precisely the position which the minority in all constituencies now occupy. It is, no doubt, true that the minority in some constituency may hold the same views as a majority in another, and thus by a rough sort of "give and take" principle there may be a colour or semblance of representation. This, however, whenever it occurs, is the result of mere chance, and not, as it ought to be, the result of a system framed to put every elector on the same footing.

The direct and immediate consequence of governing at the wrong place is that the majority govern in absolute disregard, if not defiance, of the first principles of natural justice, viz., that no man shall be affected in his life, liberty, or property, without an opportunity of being heard. At the hustings neither side is heard, or indeed intended to be heard. There is there no proposal about which any hearing is necessary. The proposals are in the Legislature, where alone they can be debated and where all should be enabled to speak.

The probable and almost necessary result of the majority thus governing is that laws are made in a form in which they would not be made if every member of the community had an equal voice and part in making them. The arguments of one man may convince twenty that they are wrong, and without hearing that one man the twenty would go wrong.

The principle of Universal Suffrage unless it results in or produces Universal Representation is on the face of it not only a mere sham, but an instrument of tyranny, for it is idle and absurd to give a man a vote and at the same time so to arrange the constituencies that he can never give any effect to that vote. In such a case he practically has no vote.

If the laws were made at the hustings; if every electoral district were, so to speak, a little kingdom in itself, there would be no other mode than the present of ascertaining the will of the majority. Each man would vote "aye" or "no" *on the particular law proposed.* But laws are not there made. The law-makers are there chosen; and these law-makers are not the law-makers of the whole constituency, but of a part only, and they go to work on behalf of *their* electors, and with their views; while those who voted for the other candidate are unheard in the House at the very time when they want to be heard, and when in justice they ought to be heard, by reason of there being no one there whom they have chosen. Is this consistent with fair play?

Let us examine this position by the light which a court of law affords. Two men are sued for some cause of action to which each has a different answer, inconsistent with that set up by his co-defendant. These two men are in the same position as Whig and Tory electors. Each wants a separate attorney or representative, for it is manifest that one could not successfully or even reasonably put forward the views of both. The law, therefore, allows each defendant under such circumstances, to appear by a different attorney, so that when the trial takes place, each may lay his own case before those who have to decide; and this is but simple justice. A Legislature—the High *Court* of Parliament—in many respects resembles an ordinary tribunal. As in the latter a man is not allowed to be a judge in his own cause, so in the former a returning officer is not allowed to be a candidate because he cannot return himself. But does this resemblance exist in law-making? Can the Free-trader in any way present the views of the Protectionist? If the majority of the people are Free-traders, we must have a Free-trade tariff; but is it not highly probable, nay almost certain, that if the Protectionists were excluded at an election, the views of the Free-traders in regard to some articles, and to some amount of duty would assume a very different shape to that in which they would be embodied if both parties were in the House in the same proportion in which they are in the country.

That the majority of the community really govern at the wrong place, and only at the wrong place, is proved by a consideration of the case of every constituency, for in no constituency are the people all one way of thinking.

In a constituency of, say 5000 (whatever number of members it returns), 2501 would elect all the members, and the votes of the remaining 2499 would be inoperative; yet each man of those 2499 has as much right to be present at the law-making as any man of the 2501. But he is not there at all because he has no part of a representative. The circumstance that parties are not so evenly balanced does not touch the question, for the principle is still the same.

This is clearly the present result of Universal Suffrage; and is it not on the face of it a manifest injustice? In such a constituency, as last suggested the minority and the majority are nearly equal, and yet the whole power of making laws is given, not *to* the majority, but *by* the majority to others.

To enable every elector to be represented in the Legislature two plans have been adopted; one, to give to every elector as many votes as there are members to be returned and to allow him to give all to one candidate, or two to one and the third to another, or to give one vote to each as at present; the other, to allow him to vote only for two out of three. In the latter plan the constituency must return three members, while in the other plan it is unnecessary, though as will presently appear it would be better that such should be the case.

If every elector could vote only for two out of three members, an approximation would be made to Universal Representation, but it would be only an approximation, as even then the majority would always have more than their due proportion of representatives. In a constituency of 5000 returning three members, 3000 would return two members and the 2000 only one. The minority would thus have only one member for 2000, while the majority would have a member for each 1500, and the majority would moreover continue to have absolute dominion at single elections rendered necessary by death or retirement.

The following Poll Book of such a constituency returning three members shows that the 3000 electors voting for *three* candidates could give *each* of them as many votes as the 2000 could give to a *single* candidate. The minority therefore would not get any share of the representation, if they were less than 2 to 3 of the electoral body. Taking 3 and 2 as the equivalents of 3000 and 2000, and supposing A. B. and C. to be Whig candidates and D. to be the Tory candidate, the voting power is thus—

	A.	B.	C.		D.
X. votes for	—	—		O. votes for	—
Y. „ „	—		—	P. „ „	—
Z. „ „		—	—		
Total.........	2	2	2	Total.........	2

Whenever therefore the majority is larger than three-fifths they could return all three members as at present; and the minority, consisting of very nearly two-fifths, would as at present be unrepresented; although they would be entitled to one of three members if they amounted to a third only of the electoral body, thus—

	A.	B.	C.	D.
The 3003 electors would vote	2002	2002	2002	
The 1997 „ „				1997
5000				

It would require good organization and arrangement to secure such a distribution of votes, but it has already been done at Birmingham, where a calculation was made and each elector told how he must vote to effect the result.

The 1997 electors in the instance just put are manifestly entitled to one of the three members, for they are more than a third of the whole body; and yet under the approximation suggested they would not get any. The present Parliamentary majority, therefore, could not say they were giving the minority anything to which they are not clearly entitled, if the system of voting for two out of three were adopted.

It may be objected to this principle that it does not give the minority as much as they are entitled to, but that objection surely does not lie in the mouth of the majority. It is, however, simple in its operation, and is at present in force in the United Kingdom in constituencies returning three members.

The system of cumulative voting—that is, giving to each elector as many votes as there are members to be returned, and allowing him to give one to each, or all to one, or two to one and one to another—is free from the objection just mentioned, and would result in producing universal representation. To prove this, take a constituency of 5000 returning three members, and suppose a third to be of opposite opinions to the two-thirds, the result of a poll would be :—

	A.	B.	C.	D.
One-third, say 1667, vote..................	...	...	...	5001
Two-thirds ,, 3333 ,, ...	3333	3333	3333	...
5000				

The last example shows that cumulative voting produces almost perfect equality of representation. It is preferable to the other system, as it does complete and ample justice to every elector, as anything over one-third would be sure of securing one member. It is not perhaps so easy to work as the other plan, which would fall in with our present system of ballot-papers, the only alteration required being in the " directions to the voter" nct to leave uncancelled more than two names. The cumulative plan would render necessary a ballot-paper for every vote—a practice at present observed in municipal elections.

In constituencies returning three members, the two plans would practically give the same result as regards representation, but in constituencies returning two members it is open to the objection that it would give the minority equal power with the majority. Thus in a constituency of 3000 :—

	A.	B.	C.
1000 vote	2000	...	...
2000 ,, ...	...	2000	2000

The plan of limiting the number of votes might be applied by increasing the number of constituencies returning three members without abolishing all the double and single ones, and the precedent of the British Parliament which repealed the Triennial Act in England and passed the Septennial in its place might be followed here by restoring the old happy medium of the Quinquennial Act which Sir Charles Duffy got repealed; and the precedent of the same Parliament might also be followed in applying the extension to the present, as well as to future Assemblies.

The result of the present Electoral System is that the views and opinions of the majority hold sway in the Assembly, and the views and opinions of the minority hold sway in the Council. How can harmony be expected under such circumstances?

To establish harmony there should be equal representation of electors, whatever the franchise may be, in both Houses. If the electors were present in both Chambers in proportion to their numbers outside, the proposed laws of the majority of each House would be toned down.

To secure an approximately fair share of representation in the Assembly some of the constituencies of that House returning one member should, by way of a commencement, merge into larger and return three members. For example, Brighton might be thrown into South Bourke, and that constituency return three members.

One of the advantages to be derived from merging the small boroughs in the electoral districts by which they are surrounded would be the annihilation of the candidate who stands on the purely "local interest." The large boroughs which are not generally actuated by such considerations, or the population of which would swamp the electoral districts by which they are surrounded would remain as they are.

To secure a fair representation in the Council the number of members should be increased by fifteen, and this increase might be gradual. In 1876 three of the provinces should return two members instead of one, and in 1878 the other three provinces should do the same; and at the periodical elections afterwards each province should return alternately two and one. The three provinces which return two in 1876, would return one each in 1878, and *vice versa*. Whenever two members are returned, no elector should vote for more than one candidate. Each party would thus have a member at a double election, and the majority would turn the scale at the elections where only one is chosen.

The levelling upwards of the Assembly towards Conservatism by the introduction into that House of the unrepresented classes and the levelling downwards of the Council towards radicalism by the introduction of the unrepresented classes into that House would make both converge towards a common centre, and bring about an identity of thought and action which at present has no existence.

The members elected by the minority could never usurp office. because, when such a member went to his constituents singly, he would have the whole electoral force to deal with, and the majority would defeat him. In short, the minority would be represented, but could never form a Ministry.

The Electoral Reforms in which we have hitherto dabbled have been of the most superficial kind. When Universal Suffrage was brought forward, it was taken for granted that the same system of voting would do for it as for a Property Suffrage; and though the maxim of "Hear both sides" is violated as much in the one case as in the other, the evil is intensified by the increase of numbers. The United Kingdom and several of the United States have opened their eyes to the fact that Universal Representation ought to be the result of Universal Suffrage, and they have accordingly adopted the plans to which we have referred. That there are enough thoughtful and clear-headed men in the Legislative Assembly able to view this matter in its proper light, we make no doubt, and it is for the Government to propound the details for their consideration.

There are at present 164,250 electors on the rolls of the various electoral districts, which in round numbers gives a member to every 2100 voters. Population in given areas will fluctuate, more or less, from time to time, so that it is impossible to give one member uniformly to every 2100 electors. The different interests—agricultural, mining, and manufacturing—must necessarily be grouped each by itself. An alteration of boundaries therefore is inexpedient. The adjustment must be by an approximation to the arithmetical basis. To take, in alphabetical order, the first constituency in the list—Ararat—we find that 1551 voters return two members; while Creswick, with 8194 voters, has two members, and Collingwood, with 8198 voters, has three members. A general rule should be adopted that where a constituency has not as many as 2100 electors for each member returned, it should be represented only by as many members as it would be entitled to if the number of voters were reduced so as to give 2100 to each member. This rule would take away one member from Ararat and give one more to Creswick. Ararat would even then be slightly over-represented, while Collingwood and Creswick would be slightly under-represented. The area of the constituency should be one of the ingredients to be considered. Where the population is sparse, it cannot so easily make itself heard by public meetings, as where it is compact. Gippsland returns two members—one for the North, with 3419 voters, and one for the South with 712 voters. United Gippsland, forming one constituency, should for the reasons already stated, return three members. Reforms on this basis would give us a few more constituencies returning three members, and would leave a great many single and double constituencies as at present. In the

" triangular" constituencies, the plan suggested by Lord Cairns, present Chancellor, and agreed to by both Lords and Commo might then be introduced. It is true that plan was objected to Mr. John Bright and others before the last general election. that election has made them alter their minds, for had it not be for that provision, Mr. Goschen would not have been returned London. The advantage of the plan is that it impartially operat to give the minority, whether Radical or Conservative, a voice.

A very short bill would embody this principle without disturbi or opening up the whole of the present Acts, and Sir James M'Cullo has now an opportunity which never fell to the lot of any form Prime Minister.

THE

MELBOURNE REVIEW.

No. 4.—October, 1876.

PORT PHILLIP.

A PRELIMINARY CHAPTER IN THE POLITICAL HISTORY OF VICTORIA.

In the lobby of the National Gallery there hangs a rude pencil sketch of a weatherboard hut on the slopes of the Yarra, overshaded by sombre masses of the primeval forest, which less than forty years ago was the sole seat of state and authority in Melbourne. There are citizens who remember that pre-historic period when Captain Lonsdale, police magistrate from Sydney, possessed, in rudimentary development, nearly all the powers now distributed between the Legislature, the Executive, and the Judiciary. But the bulk of the population—the new chums and the new generation—stand too far off from that era to know it by personal experience, and are still too close to its familiar transactions to see them in the historic perspective, which sometimes clothes the past with poetry and romance. Young Australians are, indeed, apt to glance at the early history of their country with the eye of the scorner; to find pleasant subjects for banter and burlesque in the legend of the twin Founders, reared at the dugs of the same she-wolf of convictism, struggling over the site of the future metropolis; or, of the fathers of the state hurrying to Liardet's beach to seize their spoil of Sabine maidens as they issued from the hold of the immigrant ship. But the early history of the colony deserves quite other treatment. The first settlers have left a record of capacity, fortitude and resources, which may claim an honourable place in the annals of British enterprize. They had not, like the pioneers of the Western Continent, to struggle with powerful tribes of fierce and subtle Indians, or to repel the invasion of European enemies of the mother country, or to face the hardships of an inclement climate and unfruitful soil; but they had to control and govern masses of men suddenly recruited from the ends of the earth; recruited not only from the British islands and foreign countries, but from the hulks and penitentiaries of convict settlements; they had to encounter on brief notice serious social and political problems, lying quite outside their ordinary experience, and to assume responsibilities and exercise authority " unto which they were not born," and the manner in which they discharged these weighty and unforeseen duties is well worthy of being recorded.

Towards the close of the last century the spirit of maritime adventure, which three or four generations earlier had enabled England and Spain, Holland and Portugal to become conquerors and colonizers in distant regions, broke out afresh in Europe; and England and France despatched rival expeditions to the Pacific in search of unknown or unexplored lands. The English expedition was a notable success. Captain Cook discovered the eastern coast of Australia, and inflicted upon it the cumbersome name of New South Wales. The discovery was turned to good account; the discontented colonies in North America had barely renounced the rule of the mother country, when by founding her first settlement at Botany Bay, she took possession of a continent destined to furnish a compensation for their loss. This memorable transaction happened on the eve of the first French Revolution.*

The history of Port Phillip, however, belongs exclusively to the present century. In 1802 Captain Flinders, one of Cook's associates, sailed for the Pacific in command of a new exploring expedition, and on nearing the southern coast of Australia discovered a noble land-locked harbour, with a single inlet from the ocean, guarded by cliffs and shelving hills. It was one of the cases of simultaneous discovery, of which the annals of science and exploration disclose so many; when Flinders reached Botany Bay he found that he had been anticipated a few weeks by a little craft despatched by the Governor of that settlement, who had already named the harbour after his earliest predecessor, Governor Phillip. The good news was reported to England by the first homeward bound ship, and the Colonial Office acted on it with a promptitude which has sometimes been wanting when the need was greater. Early in the ensuing year two ships freighted with convicts were despatched to take possession of the new region;—for at that time and till a generation later, the chief use of a British colony was to receive the outcasts and purchase the manufactures of the mother country. David Collins, the commander of the expedition and the governor of the intended settlement, landed his men a few miles within the Heads, which lock the entrance of Port Phillip harbour, and sat down upon a sandbank in Point Nepean; a narrow peninsula, with the raging surges of the Southern Ocean breaking on its outer cliffs, and the tranquil waters of the bay within bathing shores gay with native shrubs and creepers. After a hasty and careless inspection of the neighbourhood, he pronounced it "an unpromising and unproductive country," deficient in water and unsuitable for settlement. The district is now familiar ground, and though on a superficial view its general character appears arid and sandy, within a mile of the site of Collins's camp there are tracts of volcanic soil of singular fertility resting on a subsoil of limestone, and abundantly supplied with wholesome water, and the country pronounced unfit for settlement is occupied by the pleasant gardens and villas of a fashionable watering place. The land-locked harbours, which he barely entered and made no attempt to explore, was itself but the gateway to regions of rare productiveness and beauty, and of other regions rich in the precious metal, as the Eldorado of the poets.

---

* The continent of Australia was discovered by Captain Cook in 1770; occupied in 1788 by a convict settlement at Botany Bay.

Among the officers of the expedition, the actual character of the country could not have been altogether unknown; there has been preserved a letter from the wife of one of them to her sister in England, which rivals the enthusiasm of later colonists for the new country:—

> My pen is not able to describe half the beauties of that delightful spot (we were four months there). Much to my mortification and loss we were obliged to abandon the settlement through the whim and caprice of the Lieut.-Governor. . . Port Phillip is my favourite, and has my warmest wishes. During the time we were there I never felt one ache or pain, and I parted with it with more regret than I did my native land.*

Governor Collins, who had assisted in founding the settlement of New South Wales, and must have acquired some experience as a bushman, was strangely misled. His judgment may have been influenced by the fact that his superiors unwittingly set a *bonus* upon failure by authorising him to draw an increased allowance (exceeding a year's salary), in case it should become necessary to transfer the settlement from Port Phillip. After loitering for over three months at the mouth of the harbour, he sailed away to the neighbouring island of Van Diemen's Land, of which he became the first Governor: and happily saved Port Phillip from the discredit of becoming a penal settlement and the disaster of being "sown with rotten seed."

---

* Originally published in a "Collection of Letters for a History of New South Wales." London, Valpy, 1812.

For more than twenty years the country lay vacant, and was presumed to be worthless on the strength of Governor Collins's report to the Colonial Office. But at length individual enterprise was about to rediscover it. On the eastern border of the continent there had existed—as we have seen—for more than a generation, a penal settlement, named New South Wales, but popularly known in England as Botany Bay from the temporary site of the first encampment. Its head-quarters were at Sydney, on one of the loveliest harbours in the world, and it was ruled by a military Governor, claiming authority over the whole unknown continent. In 1824 two enterprising gentlemen (Messrs. Hume and Hovell), belonging to its handful of free settlers, organised an expedition to cross the unexplored lands which lay between them and the port named after Governor Phillip two-and-twenty years before. With some slight assistance from the Governor, and by liberal expenditure of their own means, they got an expedition on foot, and succeeded in accomplishing their undertaking:—an achievement which, for its boldness and its results, deserves an honourable place in the history of exploration. The distance, even by the devious route they followed, was under a thousand miles, and the road is now a familiar path; but the distance could be only remotely estimated by the adventurous travellers, and they were plunging into an untrodden wilderness, which imagination peopled with ferocious beasts and treacherous savages. The Governor of New South Wales, who accounted himself a sharer in the glory of the expedition, wished to signalize it by occupying the new country, and he soon after despatched an official party to make survey and reconnoissance for a settlement; but there was a power above this formidable potentate greater than he. The Colonial Office on being asked for the requisite sanction positively refused to multiply settlements, and the attempt was necessarily abandoned. For a second time Port Phillip escaped the evil destiny of being occupied by convicts.

The discovery, however, proved to be not without fruit, and of a wholesomer sort than grows in official hot-houses. The news got bruited abroad not only in Sydney but in Van Diemen's Land, which in the twenty years since the expedition of Governor Collins had grown to be a considerable settlement; and by-and-by Hume published his impressions of the new country, glowing with the enthusiasm of a discoverer. An expedition was projected from Van Diemen's Land on the receipt of the earliest authentic news; but in a settlement ruled by military authority, and consisting almost exclusively of convicts and their descendants, the impediments to individual action were as great as in the realms of the Czar or the Sultan; and it was only after years of delay, and when several official persons were propitiated into taking some pecuniary interest in the project, that a company was at length permitted to come into existence. When this company was fairly launched a rival project immediately followed, according to the habit of the enterprising competitive northern races; and early in the year 1835 two sets of adventurous colonists were preparing to sail from Hobart Town, the principal port of Van Diemen's Land, to explore the shores of Port Phillip. The first expedition was organised by Mr. Gellibrand, who had been Attorney-General of the colony, and included among its members a scion of the gubernatorial house, and was commanded by John Batman. Batman, who was a native of New South Wales, had been originally a blacksmith, but by energy and courage had raised himself to a certain prosperity and distinction. He is described as a man of remarkable endowments.—"Tall and well proportioned, and of prodigious strength, inexhaustible energy and indomitable will."* This young giant had distinguished himself in capturing bushrangers, had made himself familiar with the habits of the aborigines, and what perhaps furthered his ambition no less than these services, had skill to find favour with Governor Arthur and his little court. But he had latterly fallen into habits of self-indulgence, which had somewhat impaired his strength and elasticity. At length, on the 12th of May, 1835, he sailed in a little vessel of thirty tons, accompanied by a party of three white men and seven aborigines, and after beating about for seventeen days in the narrow straits, which are now crossed with as much punctuality as a ferry on the Yarra, landed on a promontory within Port Phillip harbour, now known as Indented Head. With characteristic energy he opened immediate communication with the natives through his Blackfellows, and in a few days concluded a contract with certain chiefs of the local tribe for the purchase of the tract of country lying between the present Melbourne and Geelong. By an instrument carefully prepared (by Mr. Gellibrand it may be surmised) the chiefs Jagajaga, Bungaree, Cooloolock, Yanyan, Monmarmaler and others did duly give, grant, enfeoff and confirm the possession of this district to him and his heirs for ever: having received therefor a valuable consideration, to wit, certain tomahawks, blankets, looking-glasses, beads, pocket-handkerchiefs, and other treasures, liberally computed as of the value of £200.

---

* Bonwick's Discovery and Settlement, West's History of Tasmania.

He entered immediately into possession of his principality and commenced the exercise of ownership by naming conspicuous places after his relations and friends; a nomenclature, however, of which modern geography fails to take any notice. When the purchase was formally reported to Governor Arthur, that potentate considered himself bound, by a recent decision of the Colonial Office, to take some objection to the force of the grant; not on the ground that the Crown was the guardian of the natives, who were in a state of pupilage, and imperfectly skilled, it may be presumed, in the law of real property, or on the ground that the position of chief in a savage tribe does not confer a feudal tenure in the common lands of the tribe, which he is empowered to sell for his private advantage, but because the lands in question were no longer the property of the natives, but of the Crown of England. The Crown, it seems, by erecting a flagstaff six hundred miles away on a coast which the Yarra Yarra tribes had probably never seen, had quite extinguished their right in the soil upon which they were born. But Governor Arthur did not doubt that the royal owner would deal liberally with the colonisers. And in due time the Colonial Office, under the mesmerism of Governor Arthur, adopted this view of their duty, by giving Mr. Batman's company, in exchange for their marvellous conveyance by the Yarra chiefs, a "remission order," (that is an order receivable by the Colonial Treasury as cash in the purchase of Crown lands) for the sum of seven thousand pounds. The district originally exchanged for beads and blankets now comprises the capital of the colony, the cities of Geelong and Collingwood, the ports of Sandridge and St. Kilda, wide stretches of agricultural land studded with homesteads and vineyards, and a suburban settlement where one may ride from sunrise to sunset among the villas and cottages of a wealthy and cultured class.

Meantime the second expedition had sailed three months after the first. It was under the command of John Pascoe Fawkner, though an accident compelled him to confide the control in the first instance to one of his associates. Fawkner, like his rival, had been an artizan, but by energy and intelligence and the happy fortune of new countries, had gradually risen to other and more liberal pursuits, and had latterly become a journalist, and more ordinarily an agent and spokesman for the convicts. He already approached the mid-way of life, and by a curious fortune was now making his second adventure in Port Phillip, having when a boy accompanied his father (one of the prisoners of the Crown) in the expedition to found a penal settlement, which Governor Collins relinquished more than a generation before. The new comers as soon as they approached the shore were warned by Batman not to become trespassers upon his purchased territory; but they were little disposed to admit his claims or submit to his authority. The later adventurers in the first instance, and finally both expeditions moved up the bay and along the River Yarra to a swampy valley, close to the river, and little more than a mile from the coast, lying between four low shelving hills, where the strange birds and wild animals of the country then found shelter, but where now stands the city of Melbourne. An angry contest over their respective rights ensued, and was not speedily composed. But the rivals soon found they had a common enemy stronger than both. The Governor of New South Wales, who claimed authority over the entire continent, as fast as individual enterprise could discover it, no sooner heard of the landing in Port Phillip than he announced himself by a proclamation, warning these adventurous pioneers of a new nation, who presumed to seek a home where the Colonial Office had recently decreed that no home must be sought, that "they would be considered as trespassers, and become liable to be dealt with in the same manner as other intruders on vacant land of the Crown." They proceeded however on their way, facing cheerfully on all hands the privations of such an enterprise; beds of opossum skins or blankets, spread under a tree and canopied by the skies, rations of tough mutton and dough baked in the ashes, and sometimes in insufficient quantity, but seasoned and made digestible by visions of great prosperity to come. In a little time they settled down to fixed pursuits—Batman and some of his associates to feed sheep and cattle, and become the type of the squatters, who have up to the present time occupied a large share of the history of the colony; Fawkner to be in turn a publican, a cultivator, and a journalist—a type of the squatter's opponents, the dwellers in towns, the men of enterprise and movement. Death cut short the career of the younger and more vigorous rival in a very few years, but Fawkner, as we know, lived to see and share the marvellous prosperity of the new country.

While these colonisers from Van Diemen's Land were clinging to the coast and squabbling over barren soil, little suitable to the farmer or the grazier, the country was about to be penetrated from the interior by a more important expedition. Major Mitchell (in later times Sir Thomas Mitchell), the Surveyor-General of New South Wales, having been brought to the borders of the Murray by official duties, crossed that river with an efficient party and entered on the unexplored territory lying beyond. By a singular fortune his unguided course lay through some of the finest tracts in the country. He passed over the pastoral plains of the Loddon, clothed with the luxurious grasses which a genial winter rears abundantly in that region, but the fierce midsummer sun cuts down like a scythe; over the lofty Australian Pyrenees, with landscapes of enchanting beauty, and into the rich alluvial lands of the West, now the wheat field of Victoria. At length he observed the waves of the ocean flowing into a silent harbour, and close by this harbour the smoke of a settlement, where he discovered, with amazement, evidences of the skill and enterprise of civilised man. In fact while Batman was organising his company tardily under official patronage, and Fawkner was gathering his humbler compeers, Mr. Henty, a trader in Launceston, had, without sound of trumpet, despatched his sons with sheep and rations, and the equipments of a whaling station, to adventure on their own account. They had sat down on the shore of a little harbour 200 miles farther westerly, that is farther from their starting point, than Port Phillip; had commenced to fish and to cultivate, and were already eating the products of the soil. The Hentys were, if not the founders, at least the first settlers of Port Phillip; and it is pleasant to know that they did not miss their fitting reward. After the lapse of an entire generation from their landing, one might see these pioneers of progress still living—prosperous and influential men; four of the brothers being at the same time members of Colonial Parliaments, in the colony whence they emigrated, or in the colony of which they were the first settlers, and the hamlet they founded having grown into a town sending two members to a local Legislature.*

The Surveyor-General comprehended the full importance of his discovery, and must have enjoyed one of the highest of human pleasures. He declared he had found another England, under more genial skies and with its lands still free to be distributed as prizes to industry and enterprise. "It is a region," he said, "more extensive

* Portland.

than Great Britain, equally rich in point of soil, and which now lies ready for the plough in many parts, as if specially prepared by the Creator for the industrious hands of Englishmen." To fix its relative value to all the territories already known on the continent, he named it Australia Felix, a title which it long retained.

From this discovery immigration to Port Phillip dates. When the tidings reached New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land they inflamed the adventurous with visions of a magnificent prosperity, of countless flocks to be depastured, and wide estates to be carved out of this bountiful land. When they reached Home, and young men were told of pastures like those of Devon and Meath, and arable tracts equal to the wheat lands of Norfolk and Tipperary, without owners, and ready to receive as masters the first bold and lucky comers, a passion for emigration began to stir among the middle classes. Gibbon Wakefield and the more reliable men placed in the van of his colonial projects, had already awakened an interest in new countries, which this revelation was well calculated to inflame. Nor were these expectations, high pitched as they were, ill-founded. The lands of the Australian continent were then free to be granted at the will of the Secretary of State, or to be sold at a nominal price, or to be temporarily occupied by consent of the Governor at Sydney, with just enough risk from the jealousy of the native tribes to add the charm of a certain excitement and romance to the adventure; and it will be seen as the narrative proceeds into how fruitful a possession the first comers entered.

The Governor at Sydney, accepting facts which he could scarcely control, recognised the intruders on Crown lands by despatching an officer to administer justice. In less than a year after the date of the prohibitory proclamation, Captain Lonsdale landed at Port Phillip, clothed with the uncircumscribed authority of a police magistrate, delegated by a military government. Before his arrival the settlers, with notable good sense, had provided for the maintenance of order by a mutual engagement to submit all disputes to the arbitration of one of Batman's company who had formerly filled the office of stipendiary magistrate in Van Diemen's Land.* A year later a more definite recognition followed. The Governor himself, at that time Sir Richard Bourke, made a personal visit to Port Phillip. This *quasi* royal visit was a great event for the infant settlement. Towns were now laid out, and town and country land submitted for sale on behalf of the Crown. The port was inspected

* Mr. James Simpson.

and partly surveyed by the commander of the ship of war which accompanied the Governor, and the waters lying nearest the settlement named, after the surveying officer, Hobson's Bay. One of the principal streets was called Bourke, in gratitude for the Governor's visit; and another obtained its name from Governor Collins, in gratitude, let us hope, for that official having so promptly carried away his two shiploads of convicts. The seat of the original settlement was named Melbourne, after the pleasant Epicurean who was then supposed to be Prime Minister; another town nearer the bay, believed to be better situated for a commercial capital, was named after the reigning monarch; and a third, which had greater natural advantages in soil and situation than either, if fortune had been kind, retained for bay and the settlement the native names of Corio and Geelong. And now authority was established, and the "intruders upon the vacant lands of the Crown" had official permission to live and to flourish, if they knew how.

The earliest want of a new community is a medium of exchange. There was no money, and orders on merchants in Sydney or Hobart Town, of uncertain value, did duty for it. But the banks of Sydney and Hobart Town speedily found it to their interest to establish branches in Melbourne. A newspaper, and soon afterwards a rival newspaper, appeared; the first conducted by Mr. Fawkner, who anticipated the device of Kossuth's "Pesthi Hirlap," by issuing it for a time in manuscript; type being scarce in Sydney, and type-founding an unknown art. After a tough struggle with the wrath of the Sydney Government at the audacity of unlicensed printing in a settlement where there was no one empowered to issue a license, the press at length got established in Melbourne. Grazing stations began to be "taken up" (as the colonial phrase runs), and one reads with curious interest of flocks being folded upon sites now occupied by prosperous towns or teeming goldfields. Melbourne in those days was a straggling village, where the fathers of the settlement were content with slab shanties, or wattle-and-daub huts; one or two brick houses erected soon afterwards never entirely ceased to be objects of reverence to early colonists, even when they were difficult to discover in the middle of a populous and extensive city. To build, indeed, was not an easy task; for the Sydney Government continued to keep itself alive in the memory of the colonists by levying heavy license fees on such industrial enterprises as brick-making and lime-burning, essential to the foundation of a country. But Sydney merchants had speculated in town allotments, and Sydney squatters had taken up cattle-runs in Port Phillip—men able to make themselves felt at head quarters; and after a time the importance of the new settlement was, in some degree, recognised by the appointment of a Superintendent to administer its local affairs, under the authority and direction of the Governor at Sydney. Thus the Port Phillip district of the colony of New South Wales was constituted.

On the 10th of September, 1839, three years after the landing of Batman and Fawkner, Charles Joseph Latrobe arrived in Melbourne to undertake the duties of this office. He had been educated among the Moravians, with a view to his becoming a minister of that sect, but ultimately sought a career in the public service. The Colonial Office had employed him in a mission among the West Indian negroes, and he had published a book of travels, marked by thought and cultivation. He had been sent to Australia, it was surmised, to become a guardian of the aborigines; but got promoted to the care of their white brothers. It must be admitted that he was fairly qualified for the task he was given to perform, which was little more than to be the medium of communication between the distant Sydney Government and the adventurous shopkeepers and sheep farmers who constituted the new settlement. But quite different work awaited him after a time, which demanded stronger and sterner faculties than any with which he was endowed. The colonists received him with delight as a precursor of the self-government for which they already longed. The *Port Phillip Patriot* congratulated them that they were not to be subject to a military or naval martinet, but to a civilian, a traveller and a man of letters; and burst into a strain of triumphant prophecy over the destiny that awaited them. "He comes as our good genius, to develope our resources and place us high in the scale of colonies. Colonies! nay, he comes to found a mighty empire."

With the Superintendent arrived some of the apparatus of local government. A branch of the Colonial Treasury was opened at Melbourne to receive the Customs duties and land fund; a Court of Quarter Sessions, and, after a little, a Supreme Court, with a resident judge, were established; a Government surveyor took up his quarters in the district; but all these officers, from the highest to the lowest, constituted merely the outpost of the establishment at Sydney, from which they derived their authority and received their instructions. The first enthusiasm of the colonists speedily cooled; they grumbled at this Sydney supremacy, and formally demanded some direct authority in their own affairs. To make themselves heard in Downing-street from the Antipodes, when a voyage to Europe occupied half a year, and the sailing of a ship was an event in the annals of the settlement, was not an easy task. But the settlers had among them men who were active, resolute, and not easily to be turned aside; and three years after the arrival of the Superintendent, their prayer was granted, in a small degree, by the establishment of Municipal Councils in Melbourne and Geelong. This concession was received with immense enthusiasm, not so much, perhaps, on account of the local improvements which the municipalities were expected to undertake—though there were high hopes on that score—as because in communities where no legislature exists, municipal institutions serve the important purpose of communicating authoritatively the wishes of the governed to the governors. And already, when this concession was made, the ambitious young community had an object in view upon which it had set its heart. The settlement had increased with singular rapidity. In 1841 it contained upwards of twelve thousand inhabitants, a third of whom resided in Melbourne; where already four hundred stone or brick houses had arisen to supplement a thousand wooden edifices, which had in part superseded the original wattle and daub huts. Nearly four hundred thousand pounds had been expended in the purchase of town and country lands, and the farmers produced a hundred and twenty bushels of grain annually in addition to potatoes and hay. But the most remarkable increase was in the flocks and herds depastured on the public lands; the fortunate owners of which were speedily becoming the wealthiest and most influential section of the community.* Among all these classes there existed a strong desire that the district might be separated from Sydney and constituted a distinct colony. The Sydney officials, indeed, had not used generously the supremacy they enjoyed. A moiety of the funds arising from the sale of land in a district was ordinarily returned to it in public works; but the settlers of Port Phillip found it impossible to get the benefit of this practice. Sales of Crown lands were held at distant and irregular intervals; less, it was alleged, to satisfy local wants than to suit the convenience of speculators in New South Wales; and sometimes, before the appointment of the Superintendent, allotments situated in the centre of Melbourne had been submitted to auction, not in that town, but in Sydney, which was more inaccessible to the people of Port Phillip at that time than Constantinople is to the

* Archer's Statistical Register.

citizens of London in our day. The State is justified in exacting a high price for the public lands if the money is to be expended for the local or general benefit of the purchasers;—in making roads for example to carry their produce to market, or in securing them the prompt administration of justice. But the Sydney Government required an inordinate price, and returned only a trifling proportion of it in public improvements. Another motive for desiring separation, which did not operate less strongly, was of a moral rather than a material origin. The settlement had been founded by free men, and they were determined that it should not be polluted by convicts; whereas New South Wales, which dominated over their interests so haughtily, consisted of a population more than one-half of which was actually under penal discipline when the settlement of Port Phillip was founded. A Separation Movement, as it was called, sprang up, of which Mr. Edward Curr, a sheep farmer from Van Diemen's Land, and a man of remarkable energy, was at once the Wilberforce and the Clarkson, the most conspicuous and the most laborious member; and it commanded the sympathies of the entire community. The new Corporation became a mouthpiece for this public sentiment, and served, moreover, as a training school in the management of public affairs; and it is a fact creditable to the young settlement that the men elected to it during the period while it was the only representative body in Port Phillip proved afterwards, when the trials and responsibilities of self-government came, to have been among the most capable men in the community.

But another and a greater change was at hand. New South Wales, originally ruled by a Governor with absolute power, tempered only by a right of appeal to the Colonial Office twelve thousand miles away, had long claimed from the Imperial Parliament some form of self-government; and in 1843 a Legislative Council was created consisting of twenty-four members, two-thirds elected by the colonists, one-third nominated by the Crown. The Port Phillip district had six members assigned to it; a boon of which it could take little effectual advantage, for the men upon whom it might best rely could not abandon their shops or stations to live in a distant city only reached by a voyage averaging a fortnight. The representation was valued chiefly as a still more authoritative organ for demanding Separation, upon which their minds were now firmly fixed. In the second session of the new Assembly, the Rev. Dr. Lang,* who had been elected for the Port Phillip district though a resident in Sydney, moved the Assembly for an address to the Queen praying that Port Phillip might be erected into a separate colony. The motion was supported by the representatives of the district, but opposed by all the members for New South Wales, with a single exception, but a memorable one—that of Robert Lowe, who is now employing his great powers upon a more conspicuous stage. The utter failure of the motion induced the Separatists to carry their complaint to a higher authority. They memorialised the Home Government, setting forth the grievances to which they were subject and the remedy they sought. The application was answered with unexpected promptitude. The late Earl of Derby, then Lord Stanley, who when a young man had seen something of colonies, administered the Colonial Office at this time, and frankly recognised the force of their claims; but in order to proceed upon safe grounds, he directed the Executive Council of Sydney to take evidence on the question. The Executive Council, consisting of Government officers looking to the Colonial Office rather than to the colonists for favour, entered on the inquiry without any predetermination to render it abortive. After hearing all the evidence tendered to them, they closed their investigation, with a report in favour of Separation. But by the time the report reached England, Sir Robert Peel's Government was broken up on the Corn Law question, Mr. Gladstone sat in the seat of Lord Stanley, and the work was in some measure to begin over again; the fluctuation of Government in England proving at all times a fruitful source of trouble and delay to the colonies. The leaders of the movement, however, did not slacken their exertions. The Press kept the subject constantly before the community, meetings were held, funds subscribed, and an agent despatched to England to "flap" the Colonial Office on their claims. New wrongs were instanced to increase the public ardour; money had either been refused for necessary works by the Legislative Assembly in New South Wales, or voted and then treacherously diverted to some Sydney project. A few light-houses, wharves, jetties, and custom-house offices for the essential purposes of trade, a couple of gaols,

---

* Dr. Lang had been elected in preference to Mr. Edward Curr, the Father of the Separation movement, mainly, it is said, by appealing to national and sectarian feeling,

---

Mr. Curr being an Englishman and a Roman Catholic; Dr. Lang, a Scotchman and a Presbyterian Minister. Dr. Lang has been, in my opinion, an extremely useful as well as a remarkably able public man; but it seems to have been always impossible to reckon upon the moment when he would start aside from the common path on an impulse of this stor. I had the satisfaction, a generation after separation, to induce the Parliament of Victoria to recognise his services in that transaction by a grant of £1000.

some police-offices, and a court-house for the administration of justice, a lunatic asylum, a post-office, and two small bridges constituted the entire public works which had been executed in the Port Phillip district. These were merely the necessary equipments of the Executive; the agencies for collecting its revenue and upholding its authority; not undertakings primarily designed for the public convenience. A little later a bridge was commenced over the Yarra at Melbourne, the only considerable bridge erected in a country larger than England; while a quarter of a million of contributions to their Land Fund had been sunk in Sydney improvements. At length, in the summer of 1848, when Europe was electric with revolutionary passions and the hope of marvellous events, a peaceful *coup d'etat,* but effective in its way, was struck on the small stage of the aspiring little settlement. At the nomination of the Port Phillip members to serve in the Sydney Legislature which happened at this time, not one candidate appeared. Mr. Leslie Foster,* who afterwards took a notable share in colonial affairs, had in the first instance been a candidate, but at the last moment was induced to retire. Nothing, it was conceived, would so effectually realise to the Colonial Office the distrust and contempt entertained by the colonists for the existing system as an abstention like this by an entire community; and it would have the additional advantage of compelling a more respectful attention to their demands in the New South Wales Legislature, as that body could not proceed legally to business in their absence. The local authorities were alternately in a panic and a rage; and exercised all their skill to defeat the popular device. A few days later, at the nomination for the borough of Melbourne, which was separately represented, Mr. Foster reappeared as a candidate. He was duly proposed and seconded, and as a single vote would suffice to elect him the ingenious strategy seemed for a moment to be defeated. The colonists, however, had not exhausted their resources. It was moved by Mr. Thomas M'Combie, and seconded by Dr. Greaves (to whom we may safely attribute the device), that the Right Hon. Earl Grey, then Secretary for the Colonies (for there had been another change), was a fit and proper person to represent the borough. A poll was taken, and the noble Earl was elected by a triumphant majority over his local competitor. Mr. Latrobe, the Superintendent, and official persons in general were much scandalised at this profane use of the name of a Peer and a Cabinet Minister; for in those days the official uniform in colonies usually covered a temper and demeanour closely akin to those which flourish under plush—grand and haughty to the ordinary world, but deferential and submissive to its proper master. Such a people, they said, were manifestly unfit for self-government; which is scarcely, I think, the reflection it will suggest to a candid reader. The Secretary of State, however, took the matter, like a man of the world, in good part; and it was doubtless this stroke which awoke him thoroughly to the conviction which he soon afterwards expressed, that Port Phillip representation had become an unreal and illusory, not a substantial, enjoyment of representative institutions.*

---

* Now Mr. Foster Fitzgerald.

But 1849 arrived, and the hope held out by Lord Stanley five years before was still far from accomplishment; and in the life of a growing settlement five years is a huge span. It was confidently stated, indeed, in letters from London, that the Colonial Office had at length made up its mind to assent; but the colonists had been taught by experience that there were many slips between the promises of that department and its performances. Suspicion and anxiety grew intense when it was accidentally discovered, by the publication of papers submitted to the Imperial Parliament, that the Superintendent had been sending home confidential despatches to the Colonial Secretary, assuring him that any form of constitution which substituted a chamber elected by the people for such a nominee Council of Advice presided over by the Governor as had formerly existed in New South Wales would be "ill suited to the real state of the settlement, and would render the administration of its government a task of extreme difficulty and responsibility." A community thwarted in its dearest purpose is not often forbearing or even just; and the comments of the Press on the Superintendent's confidential despatches were ferocious enough not to be pleasant reading even at this distance of time.

But though the Act erecting a new colony was not forthcoming, the colonists learned that the Colonial Office meditated transmitting them a gift for which they had not asked. A ship freighted with ticket-of-leave men was despatched to Port Phillip, on the pretence that New South Wales had invited convicts, and Port Phillip was still undeniably a district of New South Wales. From the foundation of the colony there had been a general understanding among the settlers to keep it free from convictism. For the two or three unsettled years before the arrival of a Superintendent, some persons had applied for assigned servants, according to the practice of the time. But from the period when the new community became organised, it seems to have steadily determined upon two things; to claim self-government, and to shut out the felonry of Great Britain and Ireland. In 1845 a cargo of convicts from England arrived in the bay, but the news created such a storm of wrath in Melbourne, that they were ordered by the Superintendent to proceed to Van Diemen's Land, where more than forty years before Governor Collins had carried their predecessors. And now in 1849, when the desire of self-government was about to be gratified, the renewal of the attempt wounded their pride as much as it alarmed their fears. A meeting was held, organised by Mr. Edward Wilson, whose name is inseparably connected with the resistance to this social pollution till its complete triumph; and where Mr. Fawkner and Mr. O'Shanassy, Mr. Heales and Mr. J. S. Johnstone, all of whom were destined to take a conspicuous part in the affairs of the colony, were spokesmen of the popular determination that the convicts should not be received. The magistrates of the city and district met soon afterwards, and endorsed the popular decision. By a fortunate coincidence the Governor of New South Wales, Sir Charles Fitzroy, was on a visit to Melbourne at the moment; able to witness the excitement, and hear the personal remonstrance of the colonists. So effectually did they use this opportunity that Sir Charles, a *ci-devant* dandy, aiming only to keep things quiet, speedily promised that no convicts should be permitted to land in Port Phillip till the feelings of the community were made known in Downing-street. The colonists on their side had already arrived at the determination that no convicts should be intruded upon their wives and children, whatever might be the response of the distant oracle. The prison ship, however, the "Randolph," in due time reached Hobson's Bay,* and the captain refusing to be bound by the concession of the Governor, insisted on his right to land his passengers; inasmuch as if he failed to do so he would imperil his insurance. Another public meeting was immediately called, at which Dr. Greaves, Mr. Colin Campbell, Mr. Lachlan Mackinnon, Mr. M'Combie, and Mr. Langlands, all representative men in a certain sense, renewed the protest of the colony. They declared that England had no constitutional right to tax the colonists for Imperial purposes by requiring them to maintain a portion of her criminals; that the introduction of felons would discredit the fair name Port Phillip had begun to acquire in England, and deter the most eligible class of emigrants from coming out, and finally, "that they had never received convicts, and were prepared to undergo any extremity rather than submit to do so." It was determined that the prisoners should not be permitted to land. This intrepid resolution, like all daring action, was originally the work of a few, but it suited the temper of the people, and was adopted with as near an approach to unanimity as can ever be attained in communities where individual opinion is free. "The convicts must not land," became the popular watchword. The Governor was in those days an absolute sovereign; wanting, however, the instrument without which absolute government is only a constitutional fiction. Having as little the temper as the resources necessary to play the part of a tyrant, he adhered to his promise, and the captain at last yielded to his peremptory orders, and set sail for Sydney. Thus for the second time in half a dozen years the colonists successfully protected themselves against the mischievous errors of the Colonial Office. But the flame was too violent to subside with a temporary success. It spread to Sydney, where the convicts were also refused admission, though the Imperial Government were able to plead a certain amount of local sanction for sending them there; finally it spread to Van Diemen's Land, then still a penal settlement, but where the younger colonists were determined to deliver it from this reproach. Popular meetings, and munificent contributions in all the colonies, marked the depth of the public feeling, which finally resulted in an Intercolonial League, with its head quarters in Van Diemen's Land, to secure the complete abolition of transportation to the Australian colonies. Though convicts had never been received in Port Phillip or South Australia, the colonies had a common interest in bringing the system to an end, as every prisoner who escaped from Van Diemen's Land loved to make a grand tour of the colonies for his amusement and profit. Mr. West, an Independent minister, and a man of vigour and culture, became president of the League, and was its chief motive power, and did not relax his work till the end in view was accomplished. The movement was conducted throughout within the limits of the law which regulates public order, even as that law is interpreted in Crown colonies, but the younger men were impatient of repeated disappointments, and the daring spirit which emptied the taxed tea into the waters of Boston harbour might have been easily awakened by any arbitrary stroke of authority. The Imperial Government, however, though tardy in their decision, being much embarrassed with the difficulty of disposing of their criminals, gradually yielded all that was demanded of them.

---

* The Sydney Legislature could not be constituted without the Port Phillip members, and the Governor ventured on the step of ordering a new election to be held for the Port Phillip district at Geelong (which cherished an angry rivalry with Melbourne), and though the Separatists set up Lord Palmerston, the Duke of Wellington, Lord John Russell, and Sir Robert Peel, local men (of considerably less distinction) were chosen by the Geelongese.

---

* The "Randolph" arrived in the Bay on August 9th, 1849.

Meantime the Port Phillip question was at length making decisive progress in England. A committee of the Privy Council, to whom the subject had been referred by Earl Grey, reported in favor of erecting the district into a separate Colony, and suggested that the name of Victoria might be conferred upon it; and an Act of the Imperial Parliament gave effect to both these recommendations. In the opening of the Australian summer, November 11th, in the year 1850, the news of these events reached the new colony. The joy of the people passed all bounds. There were public rejoicings for four days; processions, sports, bonfires, illuminations, public and private feasts could scarcely exhaust their enthusiasm; and to the present time every recurring anniversary is celebrated as a public holiday under the title of Separation Day. When the delirium had abated a little, there were not wanting grounds of apprehension and cavil in the new statute. The Imperial Parliament, feeling ill qualified to deal with minute details demanding local knowledge, had empowered the New South Wales Legislature to fix the franchise and distribute the representation of the new colony at its discretion. But the New South Wales Legislature were precisely the persons whom of all others the new colonists most feared and distrusted. From the date of Mitchell's discovery, Sydney merchants and bankers had taken possession of large tracts of the public lands of Port Phillip, which they held as tenants of the Crown, and the town population were jealous of their monopoly, and disposed to fear the subserviency of all their class on political questions to the representative of the Crown. These squatters were supreme in the Sydney Legislature, and it was feared they would employ their power to make the representation in the new colony partial and unequal. This fear did not prove ill founded. When the Act fixing the representation of Victoria became law, it was found that thirty thousand of the town population got seven members, or one member to every five thousand inhabitants; twenty-one thousand of an agricultural population got three members, or one member to seven thousand inhabitants; seven districts, chiefly pastoral, with fourteen thousand inhabitants, got seven members, or one member to two thousand inhabitants; and a number of purely pastoral districts with five thousand eight hundred inhabitants got three members, or one member to nineteen hundred and a fraction. Squatters had obtained three times as much political power, relatively to their number, as townsmen and farmers. Speaking at a later period of this distribution, an adequate judge affirmed that "*the rottenest of the old English rotten boroughs was respectable compared to the impostures of " representation" that have been deliberately created in Victoria.*" * And this legacy from the Sydney Legislature did not prove a light evil in the end.

On the 11th of July, 1851, the Governor-General at Sydney issued writs for the first election; on the 15th of the same month Mr. Latrobe was sworn in to the office of Lieutenant-Governor, to which he had been elevated; the principal persons in the public service underwent a similar happy metamorphosis, and from being subordinates in Melbourne, an outpost of New South Wales, became judges, Executive Councillors and heads of departments, in a separate State; and the Colony of Victoria was definitely organised. Captain Lonsdale, the first police magistrate, who had long acted as secretary to the Superintendent, was hoisted to the office of Colonial Secretary; from the body of the colonists the Governor was able to select an Auditor-General in Mr. Charles Hotson Ebden, one of the first squatters who crossed overland from Sydney after the discoveries of Major Mitchell; and an Attorney and Solicitor-General in Mr. William Foster Stawell and Mr. Redmond Barry of the local bar. Mr. Hoddle, a surveyor who had been relegated to the Port Phillip District many years before by the Sydney Government was named Surveyor-General. These gentlemen had after a little to bear the strain of new and unprecedented responsibilities; and were long held accountable for much which they could not control as well as some things which they undoubtedly mismanaged. Mr. Chapman in a pamphlet bearing his name† ventured to declare that the Lieutenant-Governor of Victoria found himself surrounded by "the very weakest Executive in all the colonies." Mr. Lowe somewhat later, and when the censure was certainly less applicable, assured the House of Commons that the Victorian Executive "having been trained in the school of dependence upon New South Wales, when everything of importance was referred to Sydney, were totally unequal to the duties which unforeseen circumstances threw upon them."* But in the opinion of the colonists, the officers selected from their own ranks made a favourable contrast in aptitude and ability with the effete veterans of the old system; and it is certain that Mr. Stawell, who as Attorney-General long continued to direct the public affairs of the colony, was a man in many respects singularly well qualified for his office. Of a vigorous intellect, indefatigable industry, and clear integrity, he only wanted more sympathy with the mass of the community, and less of that love of victory at all costs, which is the weakness of strong men, to be an eminent ruler. At this period, however, he can scarcely be regarded as a free agent; he was the adviser of the Governor only as far as his advice was sought, and it was still supposed to be the first duty of a colonial functionary to satisfy the Colonial Office; to satisfy the colonists came only second after an immense interval.

---

* Mr. Chapman, ex-Colonial Secretary in Van Diemen's Land, now a Judge in New Zealand, writing to *The Times.*

† Responsible Government for the Australian Colonies, by H. S. Chapman.

The new colony consisted of a territory the size of England and Wales, lying in the most southern, which in this hemisphere means the most cool and temperate, region of Australia. It is embraced on the south by the Pacific Ocean, which now carries the commerce of Europe and Australasia into five seaports; two of them landlocked, and among the safest in the world; and on the north by the Murray, a great river navigable for nearly a thousand miles. It lies in the same latitude as the warmer countries of Southern Europe, possesses a climate with all the charms and many of the inconveniences which distinguish the climate of Italy and Greece, and produces abundantly whatever fruits or cereals are to be found between the Mediterranean and the Hebrides. Since Columbus gazed with rapture on the teeming valleys of Cuba, no man had seen a new country more richly endowed with the gifts of nature.

A great change had taken place in the character and extent of the population, their pursuits, and their possessions during the fifteen years which had elapsed since the landing of Batman. The four white men who constituted that expedition were now represented by a population of nearly eighty thousand. It had grown with a rapid, steady increase. In 1841, as we have seen, the population had reached twelve thousand. In the five years between 1841 and 1846 it nearly trebled; in the four years between 1846 and 1851, this great increase again more than doubled. Of these eighty thousand, above half resided in Melbourne and the surrounding district. Official statistics* estimated the members of the learned professions at that period at three hundred and fifty-five, and "other educated persons" at a thousand. Among the mercantile and enterprizing class there had been some sudden reverses, owing mainly to over speculation in land, but there was a sound trade steadily extending, and some conspicuous instances of great prosperity. Building land, which had been purchased at about £40 an allotment of half an acre, at the early land sales, sold in a few favourite positions for £40 a foot. The houses in Melbourne had increased to upwards of four thousand, of which three thousand were of stone or brick; the remainder "of all shapes, sizes, materials, and colours." But no mere statistics and no European experience will realise to a stranger the actual aspect of a new town in a new country. The four thousand houses, which look so trim and regular in a tabular return, were sown in patches over a wide straggling township, where groves of wattles and clumps of gum trees still reared their sombre foliage. Next to the ambitious stone house of the successful merchant there squatted perhaps, a wooden shanty, roofed with zinc or tin, or it might be a tent, or a hut constructed out of packing cases, or there was a vacant space strewn with broken bottles and the tin boxes which carry unwholesome dainties from Europe. Right in the middle of the highway stood, perhaps, the stump of a gigantic gum tree, lately felled or burned; at ten perches distant you saw some public establishment at which you needed to transact business, but between you and it ran a natural watercourse cut by the semi-tropical rain in the porous soil—a rapid current if it were full, and if it were empty such a chasm as one may fancy yawned for Curtius in the Roman Forum. Close to the busiest marts of industry was often a quagmire, upon which a flock of geese found recreation; and men plunged through swamps of mud and sludge or raised clouds of gritty dust, as they tramped through the city to their daily industry. It resembled a settlement in the American Far West in its external aspect, but with the external aspect the resemblance ceased. There was no violence or disorder, no roughs or rowdies. No man carried arms, every man knew all those whom he met, as he might know his neighbours in an English country town. Outside the official class there was practical equality, and a man's social position depended upon his character and capacity alone.

---

* Memorandum on Australian Constitutions.

---

* Archer's Statistical Register.

The dress and habits of the people were simpler than those of a village at home, and nobody considered any task menial which was necessary to the successful pursuit of his business. Old colonists love to tell stories of Mr. Suchaone carrying home the groceries of his customers in a hand-barrow; or, Mr. Suchanother standing behind his bar in shirt sleeves and open vest; both having attained to a rank in latter times which lends the stories a touch of malice. But this is the common history of new settlements; Miles Standish no doubt blackened his own jack-boots on occasion, and John Arden probably carried home the dinner of his chief on a skewer; only life was more indolent on the banks of the Yarra, and less coloured by ceremony or checkered by action than in military stations. The settler in the frozen swamps of Canada, or under the biting winds of Massachusetts, had to maintain a constant struggle with nature that he might win daily bread and shelter, and his labour was liable to be interrupted by the savage whoop of the Redskin; but the genial air and bountiful soil of Australia tend to create a certain generous indolence and *insouciance*, which characterised the population at that time, before gold, the great disturber, came; and to the dwellers in towns the native race was not an object of terror so much as of contempt and pity. The colonists were indolent, it is said, but not idle; it is certain that they established the essential agencies of civilized life with commendable promptitude. Churches and schools of the principal Christian denominations had been built in Melbourne, and were served by a clergy who lived in tolerable peace together. There were two or three national societies and the rudiments of a club; but institutions for public amusement or culture there were none; and they were not greatly missed, for the habits of the people were purely domestic. An annual race meeting indeed brought out the whole population in their holiday attire; and in later times, when rival amusements are not wanting, it has still the same attraction. The young Australian loves the horse with an attachment that resembles the passion of the Arab or the Scythian rather than the tepid good-will of the European.

In the country districts the squatters reigned supreme. There was some beginning of a farming class, fifty thousand acres of land were under cultivation; but a prodigious expansion had taken place in pastoral pursuits. The squatters employed nearly seven thousand men rearing stock and saving wool, and their sheep had increased to upwards of five millions, accompanied by a proportionate supply of horses and horned cattle. The fertile lands discovered by

Major Mitchell had found masters, and masters who knew their value. A friendly critic of the period* paints these pioneers of civilization a little *en beau*. In a pamphlet published in London in 1850, he affirms that there might be found among them "men retired from their professions, whether clerical, military, naval, legal, or medical; and the younger sons of good and even noble families, who preferred seeking an active independence to pursuing the lounging life of drones in the mother country." There might also be found among them, however, prudent overseers, and even shepherds and stock-riders who had managed to buy out their masters; and adventurous farmers and artisans who had risen by prudent industry to find an opening in this fortunate pursuit. Their precise tenure of the public lands and their relations to the Executive were questions which constantly disturbed the future annals of the colony; here we have only to take note of the inevitable influence of a class so prosperous in a community so limited. Their prosperity however, had not been without check; there had been serious fluctuations in the value of money and in the price of wool; but though individuals suffered the class had prospered. The stock in the colony was valued at three millions and a half, of which nearly all was theirs, and the fixed property in purchased land, houses, and improvements belonging chiefly to other classes was barely worth as much more.

To estimate this community by its numbers alone would give a very inadequate gauge of its power and resources. Every fifth man you met had done some successful work. He had made a prosperous business, or reclaimed and fenced wild land, or imported valuable stock, or explored new country, or at lowest had built a house and planted an orchard and vineyard, when orchards and vineyards were in effect nurseries for the whole community. Or he had taken a part in the successful resistance to the Colonial Office on the convict question, or co-operated in the movement for Separation. At any rate he had furnished evidence of a certain vigour and decision of character by crossing two oceans to seek a new home. And the life of the squatter who in those days lived on his station, and partook of its cares and toils, and its occasional dangers, was training in a sort of rude chivalry—rude enough in truth sometimes. Whoever has seen the charming mansions and gardens and the graceful plantations and parks which a few of the great flockowners have created in latter years, will not be warranted in assuming that they developed by natural progression from brick or wooden villas and patches of green kitchen garden. In not a few cases they were preceded by squalid huts roofed with bark, and standing in the midst of shambles or peltries, reeking with foul air, and where fruit, vegetables and milk were unknown luxuries. And the feats of chivalry were often no more than unequal encounters with the black man. But those early settlers were trained by the nature of their pursuits to frank, fearless lives, at a time when men travelled with no other guide than the firmament and the landmarks of nature, and no protector but their right hands. Highways and bridges or punts there were none; and houses of entertainment in the Bush were far apart; but hospitality was universal, and if there were no question of their "rights," of which they were as jealous as Alabama planters, these big bearded, sun-burnt men were pleasant hosts and good fellows; and for any adequate public need would have furnished such soldiers as rode after Stonewall Jackson. The settlement had escaped by a singular fortune — not to be too much rejoiced over, perhaps—the sufferings and perils which tried the early colonists of America; but if they were not disciplined in war, they had been taught the equivalent virtue of self-help, not having been too tenderly fostered, as we have seen, by the Colonial Office, or aided in any manner from the resources of the empire. Into this peaceful community, free from all gross excesses, not fevered by the desire of sudden wealth, reposing like untroubled water under the genial sky of the South, there was soon to burst a turbulent stream, and presently a rancid sewer; and many years passed before the sediment disappeared and the waters were again clear and tranquil.

---

* Mr. Leslie Foster.

C. GAVAN DUFFY.

[The position and treatment of the Aborigines, after the occupation of Port Phillip, is a subject that can only be properly considered apart. They were certainly of a low type among aboriginal races; but they were represented to be lower than they were, by some of those who were rapidly displacing them from their hunting and camping grounds. They ate the dead bodies of their enemies; it is alleged that they had no word for prayer and no idea of a Supreme Being, and that they destroyed their children as callously as a white man destroys a litter of puppies; and it was inferred that as they resembled the lower animals in so many respects, they might be equally subjugated to the will and interests of civilized man. But some of the early explorers found them apt and intelligent (before they were taught to drink and swear); and in later times they have proved to be capable of considerable discipline. The worst stain in the history of Australian colonisation is the too tardy interest felt in the fate of the black race by the bulk of the colonists, and the cruel employment of the agencies of civilization to destroy them by some of the early settlers.]

TWELVE MONTHS' LEAVE.

It is now about twenty months ago that I had the experience of being in a ship becalmed for six consecutive days within sight of Wilson's Promontory; before this I had associated the various peaks, Mt. Latrobe, Kirsop Peak, and the Boulder Range, with pleasant recollections of beautiful scenery and of many enjoyable days encamped on or near their summits in times gone by; now however they forcibly recall a tedious week of ennui and wearisome "whistling for wind." Our ship was ten days from Melbourne before she was clear of Kent's group, and the long, last embrace of Australia became decidedly monotonous; at last however we found the wind and for many a day had enough and often too much of it.

After nearly a quarter of a century's residence in Australia, jaded with many a year's close application in a scientific occupation, and with broken health, I had been compelled at last to adopt the course—so often urged on me before—of seeking rest and renewed health by taking a year's holiday and visiting the land of my younger days. I had experienced the truth of Lord Derby's warning when speaking of the necessity of holidays and recreation, that those who neglect taking the absolutely necessary periodical holiday will eventually find themselves compelled to do so.

I had embarked in the sailing ship "Loch Maree," bound to London *via* Cape Horn, which for all our slow progress at first, was as fine a ship as one would wish to take a voyage in, a very yacht, a fast sailer, and a splendid sea boat; it is with regret, however, I have to make one serious detraction from what were otherwise all good qualities, her store room was insufficiently provided.

The voyage was a moderately good one, and not altogether devoid of incidents, one of which was extremely sad. A lady passenger fell ill with acute rheumatism, from which she was apparently recovering, when a relapse with dangerous symptoms set in, and she died in twenty-four hours. What made matters worse, the ship was running in a very heavy following sea, and the torture caused to the poor sufferer by the rolling and tumbling about can be easily imagined by those who have suffered from this painful disease. The most solemn and impressive rite of burying the dead at sea was made doubly so by its performance during a storm at night, when darkness made the howling of the tempest and the wild wind-lashed sea more terrible still. I have witnessed other burials at sea but I shall not readily forget this one; a group, consisting of the captain, officers and male passengers, with over thirty weatherbeaten sailors, all wet and dripping, assembled around the Union-Jack-covered-coffin on the quarter-deck, scarcely able to stand without clutching rope or stanchion, their faces illumined only by the occasional flashes of lightning or the ruddy glare of a couple of ship's lanterns held over the book from which the captain read the burial service, while ever and anon huge seas rushed in at the open port and over the bulwarks, threatening to engulph some of the living with the dead. It was a weird picture that night on the quarter-deck of the Loch Maree.

Before we had been at sea six weeks our store room was in a sadly exhausted condition, and we had to beg supplies of beer, wine and spirits, as well as tea and other necessaries, from the first outward bound ship we met, which happened to be the unfortunate Strathmore, afterwards lost on the Crozets. After passing the tropics it was found that fresh water had also run short, and we ran into the port of Angra, on the island of Terceira, in the Azores, to replenish the ship's tanks, where we anticipated to get a pleasant run on shore, a good supply of fruit and other things, great luxuries to people who had been nearly eighty days at sea; our disappointment and chagrin therefore can be readily imagined when we heard the Commandant would not grant the ship pratique, as the captain had brought no bill of health from Melbourne. A round robin to this dignitary and a *shell parrot* to the health officer did the business however, and permission to land came off the next morning. The interval had been occupied in scrutinising the quaint and picturesque old town, the beautiful slopes and hills covered with vineyards, orange groves and maize fields, and in watching the gradual but certain therapeutic effects on some sailors and passengers of a potent spirit which was smuggled on board from the water boats alongside.

Angra is the head-quarters of the local government of the Azores, as well as ecclesiastical centre of that archipelago, and is quite a Portuguese town, with a fine market place and a very old, but not handsome cathedral. The fortifications, which are supposed to be strong, are certainly not so; and although capable of being made almost as impregnable as Gibraltar, the defences consist merely of a few small forts like Fort Macquarie at Sydney used to be, around the quay of the very small but deep bay which forms the port. The cathedral is a very barn-like looking edifice from the exterior; the interior however is not devoid of a certain pleasing quaintness, enhanced by the old dark Spanish oak, of which the whole of the architectural features consist. The screens before the altars are of oak rather handsomely carved, but the altars themselves were gaudy in the extreme with tinfoil, Dutch leaf, tinsel and guttering candles. The priests were exceedingly polite and attentive, and threw everything open to us, and to our astonishment refused all proffered *honoraria*. The most interesting feature in the cathedral is a gallery containing from thirty to forty portraits of all the bishops of Angra from its first establishment, about 1450, to the present day.

Although the Terceirans appear to have considerable intercourse with the United States and import many of their manufactures, they have not apparently imbibed any of the enterprise or go-aheadism; and it is curious to see vehicles almost identical with those used in England in Henry the Eighth's time, with solid wooden wheels and drawn by small cows, disputing the narrow streets with the most modern American buggies—the alpha and omega of carriage building! I was informed by the health officer also, that when—a few years ago—the Government wished to establish a general cultivation of the potato over the island, they had to compel the inhabitants to plant by gentle persuasion with the points of bayonets.

The first sight of Old England after so many years' absence is seldom I should imagine, an entirely emotionless experience; it certainly was not so to me; I saw the Bishop's Rock light soon after midnight, but my first real sight of land was "The Lizards," bathed in the rays of the rising sun. A heavy westerly gale, which had driven us homewards and tumbled us about for several days previously gave place to light breezes and beautiful weather as we coasted up channel, and old recollections came crowding back as one familiar point or headland after another passed under view. So familiar indeed did the old storm-beaten coast appear, that had it not been for the sad remembrance that many, nay most, of those with whom these old reminiscences were associated are gone, I could almost have imagined it had been but *one* year instead of *twenty-five* since I last saw and knew these places.

It has been often stated that the impressions derived from a new view of old things after a long absence are sometimes interesting to others than those who experience them; whether in my case it will be found so or not remains to be shown, but the statement must be my excuse for recording some of my impressions on this occasion. My new impressions then of our grand old, but dirty River Thames were not of the most pleasing kind; it was June, and every tree, bush, and bank looked green and fresh, but for all that there was a drear desolate look about the banks, which even the charms of a bright spring morning could not dispel, and we had scarcely got as far as Woolwich when London smoke came down to greet us. It wanted only a little rain, and our old recollections of the river in the days of a voyage to Greenwich in one of the Waterman liners would have been realised. Dreary and dirty as the river appeared the docks were ten times more so, and if one forms his impressions of English railway stations and railways from the Blackwall station and line, and the station in Fenchurch-street, I think he would at once forswear railway travelling in that part of Her Majesty's dominions for evermore; for dirtier, greasier, smuttier arrangements can scarcely be conceived.

Once more in London a new era in my life commenced, a new set of experiences, with new acquaintances, and renewal of old ones, old friends and old haunts, were among the good things now before me, and concerning a few of these I now propose to give a brief sketch.

One of the first notable men I met in London was the late Sir Charles Wheatstone, then in his 73rd year, but apparently as active, vigorous, and mentally young as he was when I last saw him nearly thirty years ago. He was busy preparing some special instruments of his own for the North Polar expedition, which was at that time just about to start under the command of our old friend Captain Nares. Sir Charles Wheatstone was also conducting some experiments with a view to improvements in his beautiful automatic telegraph apparatus, and he took considerable interest and pains in explaining to me the details and peculiarities of the system, which, like all his inventions, is a wonderful fruition of a philosophical mind fertile with mechanical conceptions.

In transmitting messages by this system, a double operation is involved, *preparing* the message and *sending* it. The preparation consists in sending it through an apparatus called a *perforator*, an operation very similar to transmission by the ordinary Morse instrument, but which, instead of communicating the despatch to a distant station merely prints it in cypher on a paper fillet, the cypher consisting of a series of small and larger circular perforations representing the dots and dashes of the Morse code. The perforated fillet is then passed through the transmitter which automatically sends the message to its destination, where it appears on the "Receiver" in the ordinary form of a message on the Morse system· At first sight, the double operation of perforating and transmitting combined with the much greater complexity of apparatus than is involved in the ordinary method, makes this system appear somewhat cumbrous and complex; but if it be remembered that the great desideratum in telegraphy now-a-days is to increase the carrying capacity of the wires, which by the old system is practically limited to from 35 to 40 words a minute, while by the new one it is increased to 130 on short, or 100 on long lines, the advantages the automatic method offers seem commensurate with the increased mechanical requirements. Of course one transmitter could keep two, or even three perforators occupied, which is tantamount to putting three operators on one line. In discussing the probability of the general adoption of this system in Australia, for some sets of apparatus had already been sent to Sydney, I expressed my doubt as to their great superiority over the present instruments on lines where the work consisted mainly of numerous short despatches, while there could be no doubt of their value for transmission of long despatches and press messages. Sir Charles Wheatstone, however, was very sanguine of their being adopted generally on the main lines of the Australian telegraphs, and assured me that if only sufficiently careful and painstaking operators could be secured, after a moderate experience with the mechanical intricacies and adjustments, the method would soon become as familiar and as easily worked as the one now in operation. The system works well in the postal-telegraphs in England, and has increased the carrying power of the lines nearly threefold.

Shortly after this, Sir Charles Wheatstone went to Paris, to attend the Academy of Science, of which he was one of the eight foreign associates. While there, although full of health, with far more wire and stamina than is possessed by most men of his age, he took cold, which rapidly assumed the form of congestion of the lungs, from which he died on the 19th October, 1875.

We scarcely know for how much we are all indebted to this great man, and although most of us know enough to associate with his name many discoveries in physical science and inventions of the greatest practical utility, it is only when all his great deeds are historically collated as was done at the funeral discourses at the

Academy of Sciences in Paris, delivered by M. Dumas and M. Tresca, that we can fully appreciate what this life has been worth to the world.

A president's reception at the Royal Society of London is a kind of conversazione held during the recess, and I was fortunate enough to arrive in London a few days before the date of the one in June last year, which I attended. This was the first time I had seen the new quarters of the learned societies at Burlington House; entering from Piccadilly through a very handsome portico and gateway, I found myself in a spacious quadrangle; facing me as I entered was a noble looking façade, which is the front of the Royal Academy, while each side is flanked with handsome buildings, which are devoted to various scientific societies, these are besides the Royal Academy, the Royal Society, the Royal Astronomical Society, the Archæological Institute, the Linnean Society, and the Society of Antiquaries.

Among the notable men I met on this occasion were Dr. Hooker, the President of the Royal Society, the Duke of Argyle, Lord Lindsay, Mr. Warren de la Rue, Mr. Norman Lockyer, and Dr. Carpenter. My meeting with Mr. Lockyer was somewhat amusing. I had never met him before, for he had risen to the scientific platform long after I left England; as Dr. Hooker introduced him, he shook hands and said, " Brother in iniquity, I am glad to see you." This salute somewhat staggered me, for although I secretly admit to certain iniquities, I did not see how Lockyer should know of them; the matter was soon explained, however, for it appeared that some instruments which had been lent to the Australian Eclipse Expedition, by the Eclipse Committee of the British Association, of which Mr. Lockyer was chairman, and which were afterwards presented to the Melbourne Observatory by the same committee, turned out to be the property of the Royal Astronomical Society, and only on loan to the British Association. During my voyage to England Mr. Proctor had brought the matter before the Astronomical Society, I believe, in an unpleasant manner, and with some unpleasant accusations, which led to bitter words; and although matters were satisfactorily explained, ill-feeling remained, and Mr. Lockyer informed me he was about taking proceedings against Mr. Proctor for libel.

Lord Lindsay is an instance of a nobleman with ample means at his command, devoting them and himself almost exclusively to scientific research. At this time he had scarcely recovered from a severe attack of fever, contracted while in Mauritius for the observation of the transit of Venus, and I attributed to this fact a very quiet, unassuming demeanour, contrasting strongly with that of many of the younger devotees of science that I met, but which I subsequently found to be his natural manner. Lord Lindsay's transit of Venus expedition to Mauritius was, I believe, the best equipped of any, the national expeditions not excepted, and the Observatory he has established at Dunecht, near Aberdeen, is probably the richest in modern appliances of any extant. I was very favourably impressed with the earnestness he exhibited in his scientific work, although ill-natured people do say he is slightly touched with "Spiritualism," but I imagine no more so than many others who are sufficiently earnest or courageous to scientifically enquire into the curious phenomena coming under that name. The Duke of Argyle appeared interested in and conversant with Australian matters, more especially those pertaining to agriculture and wool growing, and kept me pretty well plied with pertinent questions on these subjects. I don't pretend to know much about the latter industry, and if I did make a blunder of a pound or so in the weight of fleeces, I think it was on the right side, that is to the credit of Australian sheep.

I had to attend the Royal Society at the first meeting of the session to be "*admitted*," for no one is a full-blown fellow, however long he may have been elected, unless he be admitted *in propria persona*. The process is simple. You are called upon by name, when you go up to the chair, shake hands with the President, who introduces you to the Society as a new fellow, after which a very ancient vellum book is put before you in which you have to sign your name. The installation is then completed. On returning to my seat I found near me, Darwin, Dr. Hector, of New Zealand, and Dr. Carpenter. Carpenter was absorbed; news had come from the Challenger which was to be read that night, the purport of which was evidently undergoing analysis in his fertile brain, and so it proved, for after the communication was read and poor Von Suhm's death announced, he enunciated a theory of ocean bottom currents to account for the apparently anomalous temperatures found by the Challenger in different parts of the Pacific. Dr. Carpenter speaks fluently, is clear even on a difficult subject but when that subject is a pet one, time flies faster with him than with his audience. I saw many celebrities this evening for the first time. On either side of the President sat the secretaries, Prof. Huxley and Prof. Stokes. Huxley I had never seen before, but recognised him from the excellent portraits of him in "Nature."

It is an ancient custom of this Society to hold its anniversary meeting on St. Andrew's Day, when the Copley and Royal medals for the year are awarded, and to afterwards adjourn to a dinner at Willis's rooms in the evening. As these dinners are usually very well attended by British and other savants, it was an excellent opportunity for meeting numerous celebrities I might not otherwise come in contact with. There were about 250 sat down to dinner, among whom were several members of the English Cabinet, and a sprinkling of foreign savants, prominent among whom was Dr. Hofmann, formerly of the College of Chemistry in London, and now of Berlin, who this year received the Copley medal for his valuable researches in chemistry. A Royal medal was awarded to Mr. Crookes for his discovery of Thallium, and of the repulsion—referable to radiation—of bodies in vacuo, Dr. Oldham also received a Royal medal for his long and important services in the science of geology. There were some few speeches after dinner, the Marquis of Salisbury spoke well and at length on the subject of Government aid to science which the present Ministry have very largely increased; in his speech he made some sly allusion to the apparently growing heterodoxy of many scientific men, and some of his remarks were evidently pointed at Huxley and Tyndall, and Huxley when speaking later in the evening returned the compliment with interest, in a vigorous and piquant speech. Tyndall, who sat just in front of me, said nothing, but was evidently much amused at the tilting; he is not altogether unscathed by time, but looks younger than I expected, considering the number of winters that have passed since I last saw him, and the "bell, book, and candling" he got for his Belfast address, and subsequent sins of the same order.

The health of the medallists having been proposed by Prof Stokes of Cambridge, in a brief but clever speech, elicited replies from Hofmann and Crookes, Dr. Oldham not being present. Hofmann spoke splendidly,and like most educated Germans who have mastered. the English tongue, in well selected language. He paid a graceful tribute to the memory of Wheatstone, speaking of the friendly and substantial help he had received from that philosopher when he first came to London, he said he connected "by a logical concatenation" the great honour that had that day been conferred on him by the award of the Copley medal, with the good help and encouragement afforded him by the late Sir Charles Wheatstone when he first tried his fortune in London as a young chemist.

I met many old and made several new friends at the meetings of the Royal Astronomical Society. Prof. Adams ("Neptune" Adams), I had seen but never personally known before, but I had the pleasure of meeting him on many occasions during my stay in England. As a mathematician and astronomer he is undoubtedly a leviathan, but he is also one of the gentlest and kindest of men; he is at present President of the Royal Astronomical Society, where he is deservedly most highly respected. Among the new acquaintances I made among astronomers, I may mention Dr. Huggins, so well known for his spectroscopic researches; Mr. Lassell, who so liberally once offered his great reflector to the Melbourne Observatory; the Rev. Mr. Pritchard, now director of the Oxford Observatory; and Mr. Newall, the owner of the great 25 refractor, who pressed me very much to visit him at his place near Gateshead, and form an opinion as to the relative merits of his refractor and the Melbourne reflector, but unfortunately I was unable to accept his invitation.

The Greenwich Observatory is generally admitted to be the astronomical head-quarters, not only of all the British Empire, but in many respects of the world generally, and naturally I took the earliest opportunity of visiting it. The town of Greenwich itself, with one exception, is just as it was thirty years ago. There was the old Ship Inn, the representative of the still older and more famous one of the good old war times, there were the same tea gardens, redolent of shrimps and water cresses, the hospital and naval school as of yore, but no old naval pensioners—not a wooden leg to be seen—and the colonnades and benches on the lawns were all forsaken, one solitary individual only of this species did I see loitering about the entrance to the Painted hall, but he had two legs and two arms complete, The pensioners have all been disposed of by some "farming" or "boarding-out" system, which I was told they much prefer to the old Hospital one, with its greater restraints. As I entered the court yard of the Observatory, I again missed the old pensioned tar who in former times generally filled up with his body the half-opened gate until satisfied of your peaceful intentions or right to enter, but now one is admitted by a solemn-looking individual in ordinary garb. I found the old place but little changed, except by the erection of the drum-shaped roof for the great equatorial, and the erection of a few temporary buildings for the practice of the "Transit of Venus." observers.

I made many visits of inspection to the Greenwich Observatory, and found very much of interest to me, and much to learn. The order and system with which the whole intricate machinery of the establishment is managed struck me very forcibly, everything goes like clockwork. The place is however very cramped for room, every available corner is used for some instrument or apparatus, and in some of the rooms the walls themselves are decked as with trophies of war, with the old quadrants, circles, and telescopes of the early days of the Observatory.

Sir George Airy, the Astronomer-royal, is now in his seventy-fifth year; he looks, however, good for another twenty, and could walk up or down the steep hill upon which the Observatory stands as vigorously as I could. The bicentenary of the foundation of the Observatory by Charles the Second was celebrated while I was in London, by a grand dinner given in the octagon room, to which I had the honour of being invited. My confrere (Mr. Russell of Sydney Observatory), who was in England at this time, was also there—as was Mr. Stone, the Astronomer-royal of the Cape of Good Hope. It was a regular astronomers' dinner, and most of those who had been engaged in the various British expeditions for observations of the transit of Venus were present. Sir George Airy on this occasion paid a high compliment to the Melbourne Observatory, and to the liberal manner with which astronomical science is fostered in Australia generally. This of course brought both the Australian astronomers to their legs, but what they said is not recorded.

Some little time after this I witnessed the ancient and interesting ceremony of conferring the freedom of the City of London, Sir George Airy being the recipient. At a meeting of the Royal Astronomical Society, a week or two after, the President referred to the honour which had been done to Sir George by the civic authorities, when a jocular member asked Sir George where the Freedom of the City was. "Under the table," was the reply, which caused some merriment; and true enough it was under the table, and was after the meeting shown to the Fellows of the Society; it consisted of the ordinary diploma on vellum, which was enshrined in a beautiful wrought golden casket, apparently of considerable value.

During a short visit to an old Australian friend, residing near Manchester, I paid a visit to Liverpool, chiefly for the purpose of seeing the Observatory, which is now situated on Bedstone Hill, near Birkenhead. It is a very handsome and well found establishment, and is devoted principally to maintaining local time chiefly for marine requirements, and to the testing and rating chronometers, for which there is a large room specially fitted and arranged, with means for keeping chronometers in any definite temperature within ordinary limits for any requisite period. This is accomplished in a simple manner, by depositing them in a moderately air-tight chamber, constructed principally of glass, which is warmed by an arrangement of regulated gas burners in a chamber beneath; the normal lower temperatures are generally found sufficient, but means are provided for testing the chronometers down to the freezing point. Mr. Hartnup, the director, has succeeded in establishing a law which governs the performance of chronometers under various temperatures, so that if one were subjected to temperatures differing, as they do from tropic to pole, the application of a correction to the rate, as deduced from the data obtained for that particular chronometer at the Observatory, will furnish the error free from the effects of temperature. The Observatory possesses a beautiful equatorial refractor, and is well supplied with the ordinary requirements of such an establishment, it is well situated, and the time-ball on its summit is conspicuous from the river, the offing, and all the docks; the site however is bleak and exposed.

While looking at the view from the roof, a Russian officer came up, escorted by an assistant, and was introduced as Baron Admiral Somebody: on hearing that I was from Melbourne, his face immediately lighted up as he said in moderately good English, "I have been in Melbourne once, in the frigate Bogatyr, a long time ago; it is a very good place, very good." I replied that I recollected the Bogatyr, and mentioned several of the officers' names. He then asked if I recollected other officers, and upon my replying, "Captain Linden," he placed his hand on his breast, and, bowing, said, "I am that Captain Linden, now Admiral Linden." He enquired after several people whom he remembered, and evidently entertained the most pleasant recollections of Melbourne, which we will trust may not have faded if ever he should in his capacity of Admiral pay us a less friendly visit than he did in the Bogatyr.

Owen's College, at Manchester, is a noble institution, not only in intention, but in its practical operation. Intended by its originator to bring high-class scientific and technical teaching within reach of the working classes, it has done even more; it has some of the best men of our day for teachers, is amply provided with splendid lecture rooms, and well supplied laboratories, workshops, and museums, devoted to the various divisions of science and technology. It was vacation when I visited it, and only Professor Roscoe, of all the professors, remained. He kindly showed me over the College, and into his own particular laboratory, where I saw much to deeply interest me. It is to be regretted that the endowment has been found barely sufficient to carry out the whole grand design of the establishment in its entirety, and in a few particulars "want of funds" is plainly proclaimed. I expected to have met my friend, Dr. Balfour Stewart, here, for he holds a professorship in the College, but he already was off for his holiday.

The Americans are great travellers, and whether in England, France, or Germany, one is sure to meet a lot of our trans-atlantic cousins; I fell in with many, all of whom were pleasant intelligent travelling companions. There were a great many staying at Leamington and about Warwick and Stratford-on-Avon; and while spending a few days in that locality I happened one day to be in the Cæsar town of Warwick castle, when an American entered into conversation about this ruined portion of the old castle, and speaking of the wholesale demolition of such places in the civil war, and of the vandalisms of Cromwell and his army, he observed, "Oliver was badly wanted at that time though, and probably he did much greater good than harm. I wish he was in the States at this present moment, he'd find a lot to do."

American tourists appeared to always have an enormous quantity of luggage, especially if there were any ladies, and I recollect meeting a gentleman leading a family of ten—all women and young children—with *tons* of luggage, into the Hotel Victoria at Interlaken; he looked the most unhappy American I ever met. I saw him a few days after in the smoking room of an hotel at Berne, when I inquired if he was travelling north. "No," he replied, "I am going to stop at Berne till some luggage of my wife's, lost somewhere down Geneva way, turns up. I am supposed to have gone to look for it, I have started inquiries, and calmly wait the result here; it's quiet, and I shall have a rest, which is more than I have had since I left Minnesota some two months ago"; and when I thought of the luggage and *the ten*, I believed him.

Paris is generally pretty full of Americans in summer time, and they were numerous in August and September; among others there I saw Jefferson, the comedian. Ladies, most of whom have "done" all the cathedrals and picture galleries of Europe, are, I think, predominant. I was much amused with one stout and ancient American dame, who was always complaining of the horrid *patois* spoken by the omnibus conductors and cabmen. She could not understand them, she said, nor could they understand her, although she had been taught French by a Parisian. She resided in *l'Avenue de l'Empereur*, but she could not make this fact clearly understood by the conductors, who always deposited her at the wrong place, until she hit upon the bright idea of giving the *Jardin Mabile* as her destination, which she said "*they always understood at once, and it is only half a mile from the Avenue.*"

It was my intention when leaving Australia to visit most of the principal Observatories in Europe. I had however been unable to shake off the ill-health in which I left Melbourne, and my medical advisers interdicted much or rapid railway travelling. In this particular therefore I was much disappointed, for besides Greenwich and Liverpool, I was only able to see the Observatories of Cambridge, Kew, Brussels, Paris, Strasbourg and Berne, at all of which however I saw much to interest me, and from the inspection of the working of which I gathered many a useful wrinkle.

The Paris Observatory is a grand old place, situated at the end of the Chestnut Avenue of the Luxembourg Palace; it contains a magnificent suite of instruments, including the new four-feet Newtonian reflector, just completed, and will be still further supplemented by an enormous refractor, which is now in course of construction. M. Le Verrier, the director, showed me over the Observatory and grounds, and pointed out with pride a very considerable addition to the latter, which had been handed over to his trust for the Observatory by the municipality of Paris.

The Newtonian reflector, which is erected in the gardens of the Observatory, is almost identical with the Melbourne telescope so far as dimensions go, and very similar to it in mounting, except that it is a Newtonian, involving rather complicated appliances to enable the observer to be always near the top of the telescope while observing, which in this case means twenty feet above the ground. The telescope was completed shortly after I saw it, but no very definite account of its performance has yet been published.

The Observatory at Strasbourg, directed by Professor Winnecke, is at present small, and perched on the roof of the University, a lofty but not very stable position. A new one, however, is about to be erected on a grand scale, for which some magnificent instruments are now being constructed by various makers in Hamburg, Vienna, and England. The open space of ground adjoining the University, on which the Observatory is to be erected, was at the time I saw it filled with the portable observatories and instruments used in the German Transit of Venus Expeditions at the Auckland Islands and Kerguelens Land.

I expected to see more effects of the siege at Strasbourg than were apparent, the mottling of the walls and ramparts produced by putting new into old work shows what a frightful battering they must have undergone, but in the town itself all signs of a bombardment have disappeared, a few new houses or repaired roofs here and there, a break or two in the tracing outside the Cathedral, is all that strikes the eye. The famous clock within the Cathedral, which was reported to have been damaged, was going as well as ever, and at the time I saw it, it was the centre of a crowd of admirers. The Germans are apparently not strengthening Strasbourg very much, but Mayence is being almost impregnably fortified, and one gateway opening towards the old Roman Aqueduct is a grand specimen of modern fortification.

The Observatory at Berne, presided over by M. Förster, is beautifully situated on a little hill on the banks of the "Aar," just out of the town; it is not a very complete establishment, but possesses a fine refractor telescope and a suite of self-registering meteorological instruments of a peculiar construction, but which appear to give very satisfactory results.

While at Berne there was an organ rehearsal in the Cathedral, which I went to hear; some of the stops of this organ are exquisite, especially the *vox humana*, and during the performance of a storm piece, a quartett on this stop was so very human that my American acquaintance before referred to said "he guessed there was a choir in the loft."

Of all the railway journeys I ever travelled, none can compare for beauty and grandeur with that from Strasbourg to Schaffhausen through the Black Forest. I was advised by Mr. Thomas Higinbotham, whom I met in London just before starting for the Continent, to see this line, and I was delighted I took his advice. The track is romantic in the extreme, as it edges along the flanks of the hills, above deep fertile valleys or precipitous gorges; tunnels, generally very short, are entered every few minutes as the line pierces some bold spur which juts across it, and the view alters every moment; it ascends the range in a serpentine manner and often as you look to the right or the left, two parallel lines of rail are seen among the rocks and pines, over which we had either passed or were about to pass in our snake-like course towards the source of the Rhine. In summer time I cannot conceive a more beautiful railway journey than this from Strasbourg to Schaffhausen. and not much less beautiful is the one from Schaffhausen to Zurich.

I have come to the conclusion that for producing thorough physical and mental fatigue, nothing can compare with the ordinary method of *doing* picture galleries. I went to the exhibition at the Royal Academy soon after I arrived in London with friends who endeavoured to look at every picture; and after the day's work was over I decided it was a most exhausting amusement, and this decision was strengthened by my after experiences in the galleries of Brussels and Paris; cathedrals are hard work, but picture galleries are infinitely harder.

I am afraid I am no judge of pictures, for I generally find myself admiring pictures which I usually find abused or condemned by artists and art critics, but at the risk of again displaying my ignorance, I cannot help indicating two pictures I saw in last year's exhibition which pleased me exceedingly; one was by Long, the painter of the "Dancing Girl," and called the "Babylonian Marriage Market." It was a large picture, but the conception and execution were more than commensurate with its dimensions; the life-like expression in which could almost be read the very thoughts of the eight or ten slave girls waiting to be offered for sale, which form the foreground of this picture, struck me as somewhat marvellous. The other was a picture of Miss Thompson's, and I think called "An Incident at Quatre Bras." It pourtrays a regiment of English infantry in square, withstanding a charge of French cuirassiers in a field of down-trodden rye. One feature in the picture forcibly attracted my attention, and tells its own tale. A red-headed bumpkin of a recruit in the inner or standing rank has evidently been watching the result of his front rank man's aim on a cuirassier, whose headlong charge seems to threaten the wall of bayonets, and he has just burst out into a laugh as the trooper tumbles clumsily out of his saddle mortally wounded, while the faces of the old soldier who has fired the shot, and most of his comrades, are solemnly stern and pale. There is something too in the trampled rye, in drawing and colour uncommonly like nature.

Our old friend Chevalier had some pictures hung here; one was the marriage of the Duke of Edinburgh, as yet unfinished; I can readily imagine the trouble and annoyance he must have undergone to accomplish that exquisite minuteness of detail of lace, ribbon, and flounce, which is one of the chief characteristics of the picture. Such work, I am afraid, coins for him neither money nor fame, and I cannot help thinking that Royal patronage of art, in his case at least, is not so good as it looks.

It was somewhat late in the year before I could spend any quiet time in my own particular neighbourhood, about Guildford and Godalming, in Surrey, one of the most lovely spots in all England, Devonshire not excepted—a district from which Birket Foster has selected all his most beautiful subjects, where he, and Hook, and other artists have chosen their residence because of its richness in lovely scenery.

While down "at home" here, I became a volunteer emigration agent, for as I went among the poor labouring people I knew of old, the contrast between the comparative plenty here, and the hard, hard toil necessary in that part of England to lay up the store for the pinching winters, struck me most painfully, it is an everlasting fight to keep out of the workhouse, or "off the parish" sustained on fare a casual or convict in Australia would turn up his nose at. It is true, however, the pinch of living is often increased by that inveterate love of Saturday night beer which prevails so much in this part of England. The number of beershops is as iniquitously large in English towns as hotels in Australia, and by the great temptation and facility they offer, constitute as big a curse to the English poor as can well be conceived. The labourer receives his wage on Saturday afternoon; he most probably owes for some beer he has had in moderation during the week, and he goes to his favourite beershop to pay for it, and of course cannot withstand the, to him, genial odour which pervades the only pleasant place he knows, and has some more, and more often than not has to be fetched home by his wife, with only half his week's earnings to support himself, wife, and children for the coming week, to pay rent, and to provide against winter; and yet these men are hard-working and industrious, are not drunkards in the ordinary meaning of the term, and would, in all probability, if removed from old influences and placed in different circumstances, become thrifty and sober individuals. I was asked a great deal about Australia, and I could plainly see there was a strong longing to get away from hard winters and grinding poverty, and try the new land—especially among the younger people. The long voyage, however, and an almost superstitious dread of the dangers of the sea, operates more than is usually believed against the migration of this class of people to Australia.

The winter set in early, and there was heavy snow in November, followed by one of those slushy thaws which Londoners know so well; one morning in the very worst of it I met a Melbourne acquaintance in Kensington Gardens, looking very blue and damp, and we mutually agreed that a good hot wind would very much improve the English climate at such times.

The time for returning to Australia approached only too rapidly, but I was enabled to extend my stay, so as once more to experience the enjoyment of a real old English Christmas among relations and old friends, and while dilating on the pleasures of the fine weather, out-of-door amusements, and glorious picnics, which belong to the Australian Christmas, I secretly felt that the bright hard frost outside, the bright fire and Christmas fare within was certainly not less enjoyable.

The homeward voyage in the ship "Highflyer" was commenced in the midst of a hard frost, and an easterly gale with heavy snow; and after a very pleasant, but uneventful voyage, with a good captain, nice gentlemanly officers, and *an excellently well-stocked store room*, we arrived in Hobson's Bay early in April last.

R. L. J. ELLERY.

SIR RICHARD HANSON.

Of the two mistakes which public opinion in a small community is liable to make—that all our geese are swans, or that all our swans are geese—perhaps the second is the more common and the more mischievous. Our growth as a people must be from within, and not from without; and if we cannot discern and appreciate our national leaders, who have the capacity to make a small state great, we are sure to be misled by those who, lending themselves to the pettiness, the selfishness, and the prejudices of the majority, only succeed too well in making even great states small. When, therefore, a man like the late Chief Justice of South Australia is suddenly removed from us, it appears to be a fitting time to point out, not only the leading characteristics of a long and honorable professional and political career, but also to take notice of the books in which he addressed a wider public, and gave to the world the results of his independent studies on theological subjects.

Sir Richard Davies Hanson* was born in London, in the year 1805, of a Nonconformist family; and was a pupil, and afterwards a friend, of the late Rev. Thos. Binney, of the Weigh-house Chapel. He was brought up for the legal profession, but early interested himself in, and was serviceable to, the formation of the colony of South Australia, on what is known as the Wakefield principle.† In conjunction with the late Mr. M. D. Hill, he assisted at a most critical period in getting the bill for the establishment of the colony passed through the House of Lords, by personal application and explanations to the Duke of Wellington. At that time Mr. Hanson was practising in London, and also reporting and writing, both for the *Globe* and the *Morning Chronicle* newspapers. He had intended to settle in South Australia among the earlier colonists, but his abilities caused him to be selected as a fit man for the appointment of Assistant Commissioner of Enquiry into the Canadian Crown Lands and Immigration affairs, just after the serious rebellion which took place in 1837. He embodied the results of the Commission in an able report, and also acted as private secretary to the then Governor of Canada, the Earl of Durham. On Lord Durham's resignation, Mr. Hanson left the Canadian public service; and afterwards emigrated to the province of Wellington, in New Zealand, where he held an official appointment till the year 1846. In that year he came to Adelaide, where, with the exception of a short visit to England, in 1869, he has resided ever since.

---

* In borrowing, by permission, a considerable portion of the sketch of our late Chief Justice's life from the work of a valued friend, I have been enabled to make the whole article more complete than I could have done unaided.

† He was then recognised as a man of unusual ability, and was one of those selected to address a meeting, held in Exeter Hall, to popularise the new scheme.

Of these thirty years of life amongst us, fifteen were spent in active professional and political life, and fifteen in the exercise of judicial functions. To us old colonists, who recollect the secretary of the league for the abolition of State aid to religion, the leader of the bar for so many years, the ablest debater in Parliament, the reformer and consolidator of the law, the name of Richard Davies Hanson must always be held in honor as that of an earnest and consistent politician, and a lawyer who loved the principles of justice more than any professional shibboleth.

He was, perhaps, too cold and cautious, too severely logical, to be the beau ideal of the popular advocate. His power over a jury lay not in rhetorical appeals to the passions, but in a marvellous clearness of statement, which set his case before them in the plainest and, at the same time, the most favourable light, and in an unerring eye for the defects of his opponent's cause. At times, however, when ruffled by opposition, or aroused by a sense of injustice, the coldness and hesitation of his delivery disappeared, and he spoke with a force and eloquence the more effective because they were so rarely used.

Great as he was at the bar, he was still more at home on the bench. His summings up were often masterpieces of clear and forcible statement; and seemed not only to carry conviction to the minds of a hesitating jury, but sometimes to overmaster the impressions they had already formed. There were occasions, but very rare ones, in which his strong prejudices and attachments might have influenced his opinions; and perhaps he had an undue impatience of the forms and rules of law. He was too apt to go to first principles, and seek for a solid foundation of abstract right where perhaps none existed. On the few occasions in which his judgments have been reversed by the Privy Council, the source of his error will be found to have been that he decided as the law ought to be rather than as it was.

It was, however, as a politician that Sir Richard Hanson exercised the greatest influence over the destinies of South Australia; no one man has done so much to mould the future of a colony. Of the ten years of his political life, he held office for nearly nine; six years as permanent Advocate-General, and three as head of a responsible Ministry; and during three years he was the guiding spirit of a great part of our legislation. A liberal and a Nonconformist, he had the strongest faith in the developing power of popular institutions, and his tendency was rather to increase than diminish the people's power of self-government. In the second year of his official life, 1852, he passed a District Councils Act which has been the basis of all succeeding legislation on the subject; and no measure which has been passed in the colony has done so much to educate the people to self-government, and to check the (at that time) dangerous tendency to centralisation. In the same year, he framed and passed the Act for the Abolition of Grand Juries, and in 1853 an Act consisting of nearly 200 clauses sweeping away many useless forms and technicalities in the administration of the Supreme Court, followed by measures dealing with the law of Trustees, and the Registration of Joint Stock Companies.

As responsible Minister, in addition to his laborious consolidation of the Criminal Law, he passed our first Patent Act, which is still in force, also the first Act authorising marriage with a deceased wife's sister, of course disallowed then, and repeatedly afterwards, before it was confirmed by Imperial authorities; he also carried the measure, since copied in the other colonies, and more recently in England, abolishing the execution of criminals in public. Mr. Hanson at first opposed Mr. Torrens's Real Property Act, but when once the principle had been distinctly approved by the Legislature he gave all the assistance in his power towards carrying it out in a practicable form. He suggested the appointment of Mr. Torrens as head of the department created to work the measure, and gave valuable aid in the subsequent amendments that were found necessary.

It ought to be mentioned both to the honour of Mr. Hanson, and to that of Sir Henry Young's Government, that when he was offered the Advocate-Generalship suddenly left vacant by the death of Smillie in 1851, he only accepted it on condition of being allowed independent action on the burning question of the day—State aid to religion. This was fully conceded, he voted against his colleagues, and formed one of the triumphant majority which put an end to the State grant for ever.

As Mr. Hanson advanced in life, he may have grown more conservative; and an incident which characterised his last election as one of the six members for the City of Adelaide might have had a tendency to shake his faith in the absolute perfection of that form of democracy which he had worked so conscientiously to establish. Adelaide at that time formed one constituency returning six members each elector having the power of voting for six. The working men of the city had formed themselves into what they called "The Political Association," for the purpose of returning members pledged to the working men's views of all public questions. Their organisation was thorough, and their tactics judicious, and, but for the informal votes, which are always most numerous among the less educated, they would have returned all the six members on their list. As it was, Mr. Hanson came in as the lowest on the poll. If the cumulative vote had been allowed, or better still, Mr. Hare's system of personal and equal representation, Mr. Hanson would have been second, and some one of kindred opinions a good fourth, for no one supposed that the Political Association numbered more than three-fifths, or at the most two-thirds of the whole number. Adelaide has since been split up into different districts, where the minorities are defeated in detail, but our occasional elections for a proportion of the Upper House are conducted on the principle which the Political Association found so effective, when a bare majority of the electors have the power of returning every representative. When Mr. Hanson, shortly after this election, was removed to the bench on the retirement of Sir Charles Cooper, the friends of representative reform, although satisfied with the choice of the Government and the peculiar fitness of Mr. Hanson for the duties of the position, could not help regretting that the man of all others who could go back to first principles, who could appreciate tendencies, and look out for dangers before they arrived—who had talent, courage and perseverance—had been removed from active political life.

In 1869, Mr. Hanson visited England, when he received the honor of Knighthood from the Queen herself. In December 1872, on the retirement of Sir James Fergusson, Sir Richard Hanson was appointed Acting-Governor, and managed the affairs of the colony till the arrival of Mr., now Sir Anthony Musgrave in June of the following year. On the appointment of the Council of the new University, he was elected to the honourable post of Chancellor; and it would have fallen to his lot to have delivered the inaugural address, if his untimely and sudden death on the 2nd March, in his seventy-first year, had not closed his public services to South Australia for ever.

His death was looked upon throughout the colony as a national calamity. From many orthodox pulpits came expressions of regret and of admiration for the earnest and conscientious seeker of truth, although the results of that search were different from what the speakers would have wished. Certainly the growth of liberal feeling since we can recollect the world must have been great when we see a man whose theological opinions were decided, heterodox and well-known, so universally lamented.

Of what those results were, it is the purpose of these pages to give a fair and distinct statement. In dedicating his well-won leisure to those theological studies which had so much attraction to his earnest and at the same time judicial mind, the late Chief Justice was an independent inquirer, pursuing a method of his own and not merely copying the suggestions and deductions of others.

His first work, "Law in Nature," consists of lectures delivered before the Philosophical Society of Adelaide in 1864, and published at the expense of that Society; but also republished in part, by Mr. Thomas Scott in England. I had not only the pleasure of hearing these lectures delivered, but was the bearer of a kindly message from Bishop Colenso in 1865, in acknowledgment of the excellence of the papers, and their timely appearance when such liberal work in a popular form was needed. The Colonial Bishop then shook hands in spirit with the Colonial Judge, though it may be questioned if he would have altogether sympathised with Sir Richard's next work, *The Jesus of History*, published by Williams and Norgate in 1869, in which the same kind of criticism which the Bishop applies to the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua is employed by the Judge on the Gospel narratives. *Letters to and from Rome*, (Williams and Norgate 1869,) purport to be translations of genuine letters of the date A.D. 61, 62, 63, between a Roman patrician interested in Paul, and a friend in Judea, from whom he asks and receives some information as to the sources of the belief which Paul so intensely held. They are the sort of letters that cannot be discovered, though we would do so much to obtain such documents if they were genuine, and they are executed with much skill. But the results of several years of labour on the subject of the early growth of Christianity are more fully embodied in Sir Richard's latest work, *Paul and the preaching of Christianity in the Primitive*

Church, which was seen here in the booksellers' shops only a few days before his death. In the preface to this last work Sir Richard says:—

> "The present work is published with my name. In publishing my former work (*The Jesus of History*) anonymously, I was influenced principally by a desire not to give pain to old friends (many of whom alas! I have since lost); but partly also by a reluctance to cut myself off from the society of persons whose acquaintance I valued, and with most of whose objects and aims I was able to sympathise. There had, indeed, been a time when in common with many others in the present day, I had been something like Joseph of Arimathea, a disciple of truth to the best of my ability, but secretly, for fear of the Christians; but that time had long passed; still, though I did not conceal my opinions, I never paraded them, and I was careful not to express them so as to wound the feelings of others, or disturb the peace of mind of those who were happy in believing, but felt themselves unequal to the task of investigating the grounds of their belief. With a few mental suppressions, I could join in the prayers, and often had great pleasure in listening to sermons in the churches of the denomination with which from my childhood I had been connected; the old words bringing back something of the old feelings. For, after all, a liberal Christianity appears to me to be among the highest expressions of our conceptions of God, and human responsibility and human destiny that have been reached."—*P. P. and the P. C., xvi.*

Of the three lives of Jesus taken from the human and not the supernatural* point of view, which we have obtained from three sources, that of the learned German professor, Strauss, is a marvel of research and subtlety, showing the widest reading in neglected fields of inquiry, and the most unsparing critical elimination of what is recent and doubtful from the records, which leaves us a very shadowy Christ with which to move the world. That of the brilliant Renan has a local colouring and a picturesque reproduction of times and modes of feeling that make it as easy reading as a romance; while that of Sir Richard Hanson has a peculiar merit of its own, as being that of a trained sifter of evidence and weigher of probabilities. He himself says that "though he might have derived some benefit from a larger acquaintance with the works of German critics, he still considers that the chief materials for coming to a conclusion lie in the New Testament itself; and in matters of external and especially of internal evidence he considers that an Englishman who has had some experience in men and things, a practical man, looking at the history of the rise and early progress of Christianity, may be as likely to form right conclusions as a German professor or divine." And this gives the *Jesus of History* its special value: that a plain man or woman with only the New Testament as a guide can judge of the grounds of the reasoning without being cumbered by the quotations from the fathers and other learned works which bristle in the pages of Strauss; and at the same time the clearer judgment of our late Chief Justice prevents him from falling into such errors as Renan has done. Renan's clinging to the authenticity and genuineness of the fourth gospel, and at the same time his determination to eliminate the miraculous from the narrative, makes him, in trying to account for the circumstantial narration of the most astounding miracles on the testimony of an eye witness, accuse Jesus in the first place, and in later editions his disciples, of getting up a thaumaturgic deception. This is most inconsistent with our conceptions of the simplicity and sincerity of the great teacher of righteousness, and we have no right to believe that his friends and followers would have been guilty of such a monstrous fraud, without much more evidence than we possess as to the genuineness of the fourth gospel. According to John, also, the relations of Jesus with his countrymen are inexplicable and unamiable, and the enigmas which he propounds, though they have from their first publication furnished food for pious thought to devout mystics, would have been very baffling to the real listeners whom he addressed in his lifetime. It is not only that there is no external evidence of the existence of any part of the Gospel according to John till the latter half of the second century, when it at once took precedence of the others, and largely shaped dogmatic theology from that day till this; but from the impossibility that during the brief course of his public ministry Jesus could have delivered addresses to his followers as diametrically opposite as those recorded in the Synoptics (Matthew, Mark, and Luke) and those related in the fourth gospel, that Sir Richard, in common with all modern biblical critics, rejects it altogether, as of no historical value. In the first case, Jesus preaches duty to God and man; in the second, faith in himself. The self-centred and altogether un-Jewish character of the teaching of Christ, his never answering any question directly, however honestly it may be asked—his ignoring every circumstance of time and place—the continual mention of the people around him as Jews, make it impossible for any unprejudiced inquirer to believe that the Gospel called by the name of St. John, can be the work of one of the twelve.

---

* Although Sir Richard Hanson does not deny the possibility of a miracle, he maintains that it requires a body of incontestable evidence to prove it, which has never yet been brought forward. He is of opinion that Jesus had a power of relieving diseases, especially those of a nervous and mental character. In most instances Jesus himself says it was their faith which healed the sufferers. See on this subject the curious difference between the narrative of Matthew (Matt. ix. 20 and seq.) and those in Mark v. 25, and Luke viii. 43. In the first case Jesus appears to have seen the woman touch the hem of his garment, and says, "Daughter be of good comfort, thy faith had made thee whole." In the other two narratives Jesus perceives that virtue had gone out of him, and inquires who it is that has touched him.

The common belief for so many centuries, that the fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse, the least Jewish and the most Jewish books of the New Testament, were written by the same author, that the apostle who in his prime of manhood wrote in the most careless and Hebraic Greek, in extreme old age surpassed in the purity of his style even the highly educated Paul, shows how uncritical dogma can be. And the historical fact that "the Eastern Christians appealed to the Synoptical Gospels and to the personal authority of John, in support of their custom of observing the Passover on the 14th of the month Nizam, while the Western Church, building on the notion promulgated by Paul, and adopted by the so-called Gospel of John, that Christ was, himself, the Passover, commemorated the crucifixion at the same time of the year, by a fast, breaking the fast for the first time on the grand festival of the resurrection on Easter Sunday" * proves that John could not have been the author of that Gospel; "and since neither party distinctly appeal to such a Gospel, the probability is, that even if it was then (in the latter part of the second century) existing, it was not generally acknowledged, and perhaps partly owes its existence to the very differences under consideration." †

In following the Synoptics, Sir Richard Hanson prefers Matthew, as being the oldest, the fullest, and the most Jewish. Although modern Christian thought has wandered far from the original type, if we trace the stream to its source, we see there the figure of a pious Jew—full of zeal for the essentials of the divine law, and impatient of the stress laid on mere forms and ceremonies; fired with the prophetic spirit which had, time after time, breathed new life into the faith, and awakened new hopes in the patriotic heart of the nation; not exclusive, not ascetic; full of Messianic ideas, and not at first believing himself to be other than the harbinger—or one of the harbingers—of the coming kingdom; leading a possible life, with comprehensible aims; and arousing natural, and not always blamable, opposition.

"It appears impossible to render justice to the scene and to the actors, unless we attempt to view them from the Jewish and Roman points of view,

---

* The Tübengen School and its Antecedents, R. W. Mackay, 265. † Ditto., 267.

When it happens that the two characters of heretic (from the Jewish) and rebel (from the Roman) are combined in the same person, so that political fears are added to theological animosities, it is obvious that the combination of the two sentiments only renders more certain the fate of the man who has aroused both. Let any one, for instance, imagine a supposed descendant of the ancient Irish kings traversing Ireland at the present day, denouncing the Romish faith and ritual in the name of the most elevated morality, that, in fact, of the Sermon on the Mount; believed by the credulous populace to be possessed of supernatural powers, and professing to have come to restore the national independence—and in realising the feelings with which such a person would be regarded by the Romish hierarchy and the English government, he may understand the feelings entertained towards Jesus by the Jewish rulers and the Roman governor."—*Jesus of History*, 317—318.

From the temporal character of the blessings and curses pronounced in the law, every turn of adversity must have been looked on by the devout Jews as caused by individual and national sins; and every affliction and humiliation could only be averted or conquered by increased piety and obedience. Patriotism took the form of piety, and a great religious genius, like Jesus of Nazareth, must have felt the condition of his people hopeless when the religious guides strained at gnats and swallowed camels—were rigorous about feasts and fasts, and Sabbaths and tithes; while they forgot the weightier matters of the law—justice, mercy and faith.

"The prolonged idyllic period of joyful hope in which the youthful prophet, followed by admiring followers, traversed the yet undesolated land, depicted with so felicitous a pencil by M. Renan, is hardly compatible with the actual realities of his age and country. The sanguinary rule of the great Herod had been succeeded by a period of disorder and tumult, of insurrection and repression, that continued till the final outbreak that ended with the siege and destruction of Jerusalem. The people were ready to listen to any one who announced that the kingdom of Heaven was at hand, for that implied deliverance from the hated yoke of the Gentile; and they would be ready, also, to listen to his exhortations to amendment of life, and to the newer, loftier, and more spiritual interpretation of the law. But this was only on the condition that the realisation of his predictions should speedily follow their proclamation, and when this condition was not fulfilled, they would, for the most part, fall away from him as rapidly as they had been attracted."—*Jesus of History*, 184.

In following step by step the life of Jesus as recorded by Matthew, Sir Richard Hanson leaves out evident subsequent additions, such as the legends of the nativity. The remarkable circumstance that the two Gospels which assert that Christ had no human father contain the genealogy through Joseph, and that the genealogies differ beyond the possibility of reconciliation, shows not only that there was no connivance between the writers, but also that there was wonderfully little editorial skill in the final *redacteur* of each Gospel, who wished to preserve the original Messianic idea, that Jesus was the son of David, as well as to include the later apprehension of the Church, that he was miraculously the Son of God. Neither the second nor fourth Gospel makes any mention of the miraculous birth at Bethlehem, and indeed the latter seems to exclude it by implication. (John i. 45-46.)

Mark's meagre biography represents Jesus as rather a great miracle worker than as a moral teacher; it simply leaves out what to us is the most valuable part of the first Gospel, while that of Luke only claims to collect from traditionary sources an account of " those things which are most *surely believed* among us" (not those which really happened), and was written at a later date, and shows the growth of a less exclusively Jewish framework of Christianity. As the writer of the Acts of the Apostles, whose steady aim is to reconcile the actions, the aims and beliefs of the founders of the Christian Church, and to ignore their dissensions in a manner quite irreconcilable with the letters of Paul and the Apocalypse, the testimony of the Gospel according to Luke is to be received with great hesitation when it differs from the earlier records. Luke represents the transition stage in the growth of dogma clinging to the skirts of the common tradition, but adding to and ornamenting it with new ideas suited to the newer conditions. Where he agrees with Matthew, it is almost word for word; where he differs, it is invariably to give expression to his communistic views, and to his opinion that the kingdom was to be enjoyed by others than the Jews. When the author of John wrote, he no longer caught at the skirts of the old tradition; dogma had by this time hardened, the message was lost in the messenger; the personality of Christ, his mysterious connection with God, the connection with him which his disciples might attain to; the personification of the Spirit—the Paraclete—as the authorised means of communication between believers and the Father and the only begotten Son; all this resulted in a Trinity which has shaped Christian faith into one pattern ever since.

If it had not been for the confident anticipation of the Primitive Church, that the end of the world was at hand, the life of Christ might have been written earlier, and have been more carefully preserved. The earliest Gospel of which we have any trace or tradition, the " Logia" of Matthew, was written in Hebrew, and was soon lost. We presume that our present Gospel, originally written in Greek, was mainly derived from this original collection of the sayings of Christ, which probably was somewhat similar to that which Rammohun Roy selected from the New Testament for the use of Hindoos, because the Gospel miracles were so much less stupendous than those of their own mythology, that they only weakened the cause of Christianity. For the satisfaction of the modern critical and inquiring mind, it is a trustworthy narrative of the deeds of Jesus by an eye witness that is the desideratum; but yet, as the earliest records seem to have been of his sayings, so will the latest memory of Jesus be associated with those sublime utterances which for so many centuries have animated and sustained millions of human souls. The miraculous events, reported in the Gospels, apparently were so much matters of course, that they did not prove his mission clearly even to bystanders, drop off as deforming accretions of tradition, and the man himself, his life, his death, his aims and his hopes, remain a help and guide to us here and now.

In some points where our late Chief Justice differs from Strauss, his reasoning is clear and cogent. In old times, when Christianity was considered to be either all truth or all imposture, the coarse assaults of Deists spared no one, not even Christ himself; but now that the mythical theory is called in to account for the miraculous element, the general opinion of the most advanced critics is that the noblest utterances of Jesus are likely to be the most genuine, and Sir Richard's reasons for preferring the beatitudes in Matthew to those in Luke would find an echo in every devout mind.

> "With regard to the Sermon on the Mount, the version of the first Gospel is almost universally followed so far as the blessings are concerned. In fact, it may be doubted whether, during the last century, any sermon has been preached in England having the beatitudes in the third Gospel, with their corresponding denunciations, as its subject. It is true, no doubt, that the parable of the rich man and Lazarus is often made the subject of sermon and commentary, but it is interpreted in a spirit diametrically opposite to that in which it is composed, for excess and hard-heartedness are ascribed to the rich man and holiness to Lazarus, while the parable itself contains not a hint of any thing of the kind."—*Jesus of History*, 201.

As an example of his reasoning, to prove that the healing of the centurion's servant, Matt. viii., 5—13, is altogether a later myth interpolated into Matthew's narrative, we quote as follows:—

> "The Jews were regarded by the Roman legionaries in much the same manner as the Hindoos are regarded by the English troops quartered among them. The improbability of the account may, therefore, be judged of by supposing the

parties to be an Indian Fakir and an English colonel of a cavalry regiment. If we are to regard the account as true, our only conclusion, however painful and seemingly irreverent it may appear, would be that Jesus was so flattered by the homage paid him by a foreigner of rank and influence as to have been forgetful or ungrateful towards the disciples, who had at his call abandoned all and followed him; and even this assumption accounts for only half his speech. It may have induced Jesus to recognise and declare the fact that the Gentiles should be admitted, but it could supply no motive to proclaim that the Jews should be cast out from the kingdom. And if we further consider the inconsistency between the conduct here attributed to Jesus towards this Gentile, who was a man in authority, and that subsequently pursued in the case of the humble Syro-Phœnician woman, whose prayer for help he in the first instance rejects, on the ground that he is only sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and his sending his apostles exclusively to Israelites, we cannot avoid the conclusion that the whole incident is a later interpolation; and this inference is strengthened by the fact that the event is not related in the second Gospel, where it would unquestionably have had a place if the writer had known of its existence."—*Jesus of History*, 234, and note.

In the *Jesus of History*, Sir Richard's idea with regard to the great central miracle of Christianity, the only miracle which is supported in the epistles, and which was universally believed, the resurrection of Christ, appears to be that he really died; but that some hallucination or some unknown circumstances acting on the excited minds of the apostles produced the belief in the resurrection. In the succeeding work, *Paul and the Primitive Church*, he seems to have arrived at a different conclusion, and to be of opinion that Jesus was not really dead, but that some friendly hands, on perceiving signs of life, had spent the intervening Sabbath in reviving him and conveyed him to Galilee, where according to Matthew and Mark, he appointed his disciples to meet him; and that there, in a place of greater safety than excited Judea, those who had preserved him allowed him one or more interviews with his friends and chosen disciples. Renan and Strauss, both from different reasons, believe that Jesus was really dead, although they confess that the crucifixion alone for such a short time could not have caused death. Vigorous criminals have lived for days on the cross, and at last died of hunger; and if we suppose the three hours of darkness* to be all in which Christ was nailed to the cross, it is quite possible that he had only fainted from pain and loss of blood. The hurried preparations for burial on the approach of the Sabbath, the open tomb, the unknown Joseph of Arimathea, never heard of before or afterwards, all admit of the possibility of life not being really extinct; and the apostles and disciples, cast down utterly and dispersed, incredulous when told that he was risen, do not appear to have been so highly strung as to be liable to hallucinations until after the miracle had been apparently wrought.

---

* Mark alone gives the time as six hours; but agrees with Matthew and Luke in the three hours of darkness. There is no time and no darkness mentioned by John.

"This conduct implies no fraud on the part of Jesus and his friends, for they might regard the resuscitation as miraculous." Who could be better judges of death than the Roman soldiers who had seen that he was dead when they delivered up the body? The Messianic prophecies as to his body not being left in Sheol, or allowed to see corruption, would be regarded as fulfilled, and they would see in this marvellous resuscitation "a pledge that he would shortly be enabled to return and establish his kingdom. Nor would the Apostles in their first transports of joy be disposed to scrutinise too narrowly the circumstances."

The scientific spirit was unknown to devout Jews. If Elijah and Elisha had raised the dead to life, surely God would not allow the Messiah to be holden of death.

> "That a victim had escaped with life from the grasp of Pilate, that priest and Pharisee and Gentile ruler should have combined to compass the death of one solitary prisoner, and have failed to accomplish their purpose, that the very grave should have given up its prey, and have restored to his followers the Master whose loss they deplored, were circumstances so exceptional that they might well warrant to their minds a belief in their supernatural character, and inspire them with a full conviction that he whom God had thus preserved would by the same divine aid be enabled to establish the Kingdom of Heaven." —*Paul and the Primitive Church*, *56*.

In answer to Strauss's argument against this theory, Sir Richard says:—

> "It may be objected to this reasoning that the sight of a weak and suffering man, who must presumably have died in a few days, could not have given any confidence and enthusiasm to the apostles. But we must remember that the various stories of martyrdom in the early Christian Church contained many cases of supernatural interference which delayed but did not prevent the ultimate death of the victim."

Fires might refuse to burn, or wild beasts to devour, but yet the martyr died at last, without shaking the general faith in the reality of the miraculous though fruitless intervention.

> "And with regard to the subsequent death, we must remember that the apostles could not expect the return of Jesus from heaven to establish his kingdom until they knew that he had left the world, and this death might be the

> necessary condition of their faith in his having been taken up into heaven. If God had once raised him from the dead, they could have no difficulty in believing that he would in the appointed time restore him to earth, either to re-animate the body he had left behind, or clothed in some new and glorious body corresponding to his new character. *. * * Paul certainly did not believe that Jesus had taken his material body, but a spiritual or aërial body, with him to heaven, and the apostles regarded him as a man, whose shade, instead of dwelling in Sheol, had been admitted into heaven, and would wait with patience until it should return to reanimate the natural body, so that in neither case would there be the difficulty which we, with our modern ideas, feel."—*Paul and the Primitive Church*, 57.

The nameless young man of Mark clothed in a long white garment who might have been deputed by his secret friends to announce the revival of Jesus and his departure to Galilee, may have given rise to the first myth of *one* angel of Matthew, and the heap of linen clothes at the other end of the tomb might easily be transformed by gathering rumour into the *second* angel of Luke.* The curious growth of myth between the time when the Gospel according to Luke was written, and the period when the same writer or some one adopting his identity, compiled the Acts of the Apostles, may be clearly seen in the two accounts of the ascension of Jesus.

In the case of the gospel, Luke xxiv. 52, Jesus was parted from his disciples, and received up into heaven (which might be said and is said of the death of every Christian teacher); in the Acts there is the detailed bodily ascension, and two angels appear to make the whole thing clear, according to the prevailing dogmas of the day, saying: "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." (Acts i. 10-11.)

> "It is difficult to understand how the record of the interview, which (according to the strongest traditions of the church) the apostles had with their resuscitated Lord, should have been so completely lost as has been the case, for the account given in the first Gospel is certainly not the original version, and the last verses of the second Gospel which might be expected to contain it, have been lost, and their place supplied by a later interpolation.† Possibly the actual facts were too prosaic in their character to allow free scope for the imagination, and the legend found more room for development in a region where

---

* See on this subject, "The Fair Haven," by the author of "Erewhon," in which book Sir Richard Hanson's "Jesus of History," is spoken of as a leading work on these questions.

† According to all reliable criticism, Mark should end with the 8th verse of the final chapter,

it was untrammelled by any definite tradition, or it might be that the discourses originally attributed to Jesus on the occasion were unsuitable to the altered position of the Church, when his second coming had been so unexpectedly delayed, and, therefore dropped out of tradition like a great deal more that we would have gladly retained.

"May it not be," adds Sir Richard in a note, "that the discourses connected with the sending forth of the twelve (Matthew, x. 4., *et seq.*), were originally supposed to have been spoken by Jesus at the final interview in Galilee? Certainly many of the injunctions and warnings are more appropriate to that period than to the period with which they are now connected."—*Paul and the Primitive Church, 59 and note.*

The legendary character of the book of the Acts of the Apostles, and especially of the first portion of it, makes it require much sifting. What was called the descent of the Holy Ghost on the Day of Pentecost was characterised by intense religious excitement, and by the speaking in unknown tongues, which is not at all unprecedented in religious revivals now-a-days. Paul's account of this latter gift in his epistles is intelligible, and the early tradition of the Church, that Mark, the interpreter of Peter, wrote his gospel of Memorabilia from Peter's *viva voce* recollections, proves that the gift of tongues was not considered to enable Peter to speak or write in a language he had not learned.

The enumeration which Paul gives of spiritual gifts shows that the miracles and gifts of healing in possession of the Church could not have been so stupendous as they are recorded to be. "And God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues." (I. Cor., xii. 28.) And the tongues he places lowest of all, except that in another passage of the same chapter he places still lower the interpretation of those mysterious utterances into intelligible sounds.

The difficult feature of these early times for us to realise in modern days is the firm conviction of the Primitive Church that in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, Christ would return—to-day, to-morrow, or any day. The communism of the early Church was a natural result of this universal expectation; the richer brethren were willing to maintain the poorer for the few days in which this present system of things was to last, and would be promised rewards in consequence; all work might cease, the one thing needful was to be prepared for the coming of the Lord, and that was to be realised by almost continual religious exercises. The author of the Acts has no doubt accurately depicted the feelings, aspirations, and conduct of the society in language so simple and yet so effective that it finds an echo in the hearts of all enthusiastic reformers, eager in their first hopes of moving the world to better things. "They continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers; and all that believed were together, and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need. And they continuing daily in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favour with the people." (Acts ii. 42, *et seq.*)

> "We can understand that the authorities may have forbidden the preaching—not of the resurrection of the dead, for that the bulk of the Jews believed, nor even the resurrection of Jesus, which they would consider a harmless delusion, but the immediate establishment of the kingdom through Jesus—attended with what might appear to be disorderly gatherings of the people. Also that the prisons of Jerusalem might be no more able to retain Peter and John than those of Dublin recently proved to retain Head-centre Stephens. * * * But the agency that permitted escapes from prison when its proceedings were shrouded in darkness could not save the leaders of the society from arrest and scourging, or, in the case of Stephen, from death itself, when these were inflicted in the presence of the rulers or in the face of the public. This irresistibly suggests a human agency, since we cannot suppose a divine interference would be less effective by reason of the publicity of the occasion or have failed to be exerted when its intervention was most urgently needed."—*Paul and the Primitive Church*, 69.

The death of Ananias and Sapphira was the occasion of a very strong opposition to the infant Church, and, whether we believe the miracle or not, it is very natural that this should have been the case.

> "The Sanhedrim could not stand idly by when they heard of miracles that had inflicted death on two citizens guiltless of any legal wrong. They had attended a meeting of the society, and had never been seen alive since. If the event was supposed to be miraculous, it would only fix on the apostles the charge of using the worst and darkest forms of magic; but the Sanhedrim, Sadducees for the most part, would ridicule that suggestion, and persist in attributing the deaths to natural causes, and in holding the members of the society responsible for them; and every modern jurist and magistrate would say that they were right."—*Paul and the Primitive Church*, 73—74.
>
> "No community could tolerate a society, however pure its motives, and spiritual its aspirations, or even however true its doctrines, which punished a breach of its rules by death."—74.

Here I cannot adopt the views suggested by Sir Richard. Instead of accusing Peter or his zealous disciples of such a crime, it seems to me much more probable that the tale is one of those myths which have grown round the early narrative.

The very different reception of the same doctrines from the mouth of Stephen, to its joyful acceptance from the mouth of Paul, shows that the Society had become unpopular, and as Stephen was one of those charged with the distribution, so Sir Richard supposes that he might also be concerned in the collection of the common funds, which was attended by such suspicious circumstances, and be a special object of popular indignation. We hear that the society was broken up and dispersed, and that all except the Apostles left Jerusalem (though of their stay there, Sir Richard is very doubtful), and occupied themselves in preaching the coming kingdom all over the country.

After this begins another period in the history of the Church which was no longer communistic; and under its new organisation, by James the brother of Jesus (according to the received view, *not* one of the Apostles), it evidently did not again provoke popular fury. With the single exception of the repressive measures taken by Herod, the Apostles appear to have lived in Jerusalem having favour with the people, and without provoking the active hostility of the government, for a period of probably from twenty to twenty-five years, when James, the Lord's brother, was put to death by Ananias the high priest for the time. The real position of James is one of the standing enigmas of early Church history. Sir Richard throws out a hint that among all those bewildering Marys of the New Testament, one of those who accompanied Jesus to Jerusalem might have been the mother of Jesus; she is called Mary the mother of James and *Joses*, perhaps a false reading for James and Jesus. James was presumably of the party. (*Jesus of History*, 262, note). The unwillingness of the later Church to allow that Jesus had any brothers, and especially in this connection, where James is evidently the elder, which would completely do away with the idea of the virginity of Mary, would favour the commission and the perpetuation of an error in transcription.

As months and years elapsed, and, though the disciples had gone over all the cities of Judah preaching the kingdom, still Christ did not re-appear, the contributions of the richer would be exhausted and the idle though devout poor could not continue to live on the property of others. Organised voluntary contributions were obtained from distant churches for the poor saints of Jerusalem; but communism ceases, and something like steady industry must have taken its place. And now first appears upon the scene as an ally, the sometime persecutor Saul, who, as the Apostle Paul, was the most powerful instrument for the spread of Christianity, and who by modifying and altering much of the original message made it reach a wider circle, and obtain a permanent hold upon humanity. In dealing with the life and doctrine of Paul, I think that Sir Richard Hanson shows even more originality and penetration than in his life of Jesus. I must however, express my emphatic dissent from his conclusion that, whatever influence Paul exerted came in at a later time, as the result of his writings, and has always been small; for I consider that those, the earliest, the most genuine and the ablest of the Christian records, have shaped the faith of the Church. Pauline Christianity, with its vivid emotional, and its clear dogmatic teaching, has cast into the shade the more colourless and catholic teaching of the Great Master himself. It is difficult for us to shake off our impressions and prejudices, and to suppose that in the differences between Paul and the earlier apostles, of which he gives such a strong *ex parte* statement, he might be in the wrong quite as much as they.

Sir Richard says in his preface that when he continued his work where he had left off, and began to inquire into the preaching of Christianity in the Primitive Church.

> "The results of the investigation were so different from what I had anticipated, that I feared lest the effect of any work I might write would rather derogate from the character of the Apostle than free him from the charges made against him. I confess that I shrank from such a consequence; and for a time relinquished my inquiries. I not only admired, but felt almost a personal regard for him, and I had so completely accepted the view that he gave of himself and his opponents that I looked upon him as the one man who gave dignity to the Apostolic age, and redeemed it from the charge of bigotry and narrow-mindedness. I was reluctant to continue an inquiry that threatened to compel me to change these opinions."—*Paul and the Primitive Church*, i.

In the absence of any trustworthy advocate for Peter, James, and John, our late Chief Justice, true to the principles of English law, constitutes himself their defender, pieces together the obscure and veiled attacks in Revelations, in James, and in Jude, extorts even from the reluctant author* of the Acts, evidence of the differences, that the book was expressly written to gloss over and ignore, and above all draws from Paul's own defences the weak points in his own case, in a masterly and convincing manner.

---

* The able writer of a series of articles recently published in *Fraser's Magazine* maintains that Timothy was the author of the Acts of the Apostles, and that if he were not, the writer has shown some disingenuousness.

The quarrel with Barnabas, Paul's earliest and best friend, in which Paul was clearly wrong; the account of the dispute with Peter at Antioch, of which Paul gives so vehement a description, (Galatians ii.) the irregularities in the Corinthian Church, which Paul must have permitted while he preached there; the reasons why those whom he calls false brethren opposed Paul's doctrine and practice; the innovations he introduced; are all carefully worked out by our author to show the extent of the schism which he created. If his books had perished and those of others had survived, the Christian Church would have been shaped differently, if it continued to exist as an institution at all. It is very doubtful if Christianity would have spread without some of Paul's high-handed irregularities; a close community still essentially Jewish, a sect within a sect, could have won over a very small portion of the heathen around them, especially as the confident expectation of the coming kingdom was so long delayed. Paul's easy admission into the Church by baptism, and not requiring from converts that strict, vexatious, and offensive separation from their former friends in so much of the every-day course of life which was tinged and modified by idolatrous practices, must have facilitated the reception of Christianity by thousands who did not in any way comprehend the bearing of his special doctrines; only that it was something purer and grander than any thing before known, and that by baptism they would be made heirs of the kingdom, and reign for ever with the Lord in a present and terrestrial Heaven.

Sir Richard accepts the epistles of Paul as genuine, all but the pastoral epistles, which in his opinion have marks of much later composition. He has doubts as to the Ephesians, because he thinks it not likely that Paul should have addressed so colourless a letter to the Church to which he had ministered in the most stormy part of his career; where he fought, figuratively, with wild beasts—according to the orthodox language of the day, Judaising Christians—but apparently emissaries from the Head Church at Jerusalem. If the epistle to the Ephesians were really the lost epistle to the Laodiceans, then there is more likelihood of its genuineness.

In the earliest of Paul's letters, those to the Thessalonians, there is an absence of the great leading doctrines which characterise Pauline Christianity, for which cause the Tübingen school deny their genuineness; but as it is probable that Paul did not arrive at his complete system of theology all at once, and these epistles were written before he had been brought into collision with those zealous for the law, it is quite possible that Paul might write to his Gentile converts at Thessalonica on practical objects, and preach the moral virtues—temperance, chastity, and industry—which might be the hardest, as well as the most useful, part of the new life to them. In the first epistle, he speaks of the immediate coming of the Lord, and that all the living who were baptised would be caught up, after all the dead who had been baptised had been raised, so they should all be ever with the Lord. The obscure text in Corinthians about being baptised for the dead which orthodox commentators find it so hard to explain, may be cleared up by the suggestion that those who wished their unbaptised dead friends to share with them in the glories of the second coming were baptised for them by proxy.

Paul's doctrine grew with the circumstances and the exigencies of his position, and when emissaries from the central Church came to disturb his converts—to assert that their admission into the Church was invalid, and that without circumcision and the observances of the Jewish law they would not be heirs of the kingdom—Paul, in his letter to the Galatians, vindicates himself—claims for the first time the title of apostle (not of men, but of God), and declares that he has received the Gospel of liberty by direct revelation—reproaches Peter with weakness and dissimulation in no measured terms, and makes what to our modern ideas is that noble stand for Christian freedom, which eventually separated Christianity entirely from the Jewish people; a result which we cannot believe that Jesus of Nazareth ever foresaw or could have desired. This protest of Paul's, in combination with the later Johannine Gospel, has altogether changed the rallying point of Christianity from the expectation of a Jewish Messiah who should make the seed of Abraham the rulers of the world, to that of a world-embracing faith in a Saviour of the whole human race; which has, under various forms and with almost infinite variety of interpretation, been the religion of the dominant races in the world from those times till the present day.

The stupendousness of the result of Paul's teachings has seemed to paralyse critics and theologians as to its original sources and its real bearing. To his dogmas, as to the simpler precepts of the master, many deforming accretions have clung, and Paul would have been astonished had he been told of what afterwards was deduced from his strong hyperboles, his fanciful illustrations, and his liberal, but by no means always apt or accurate quotations and applications of the Old Testament Scriptures. To those who would like to inquire into the doctrines actually taught by Paul, as they were understood and embraced by the more intelligent of his converts, we would especially recommend the tenth chapter in Sir Richard Hanson's book.

Paul's doctrine of election was his natural deduction from the observed fact that the Jews rejected his Gospel, and the Gentiles received it; and also from his own consciousness that he, a persecutor, who had deserved no special favour but the contrary, should have been chosen to be an apostle, and a minister of grace to thousands. His asceticism and views as to marriage were probably somewhat peculiar to himself, and recommended to others in the prospect of the near end of this present world. His opinion that the flesh is all evil, and the spirit all good, has a tinge of Gnosticism in it, but cannot hold its ground for a moment when we consider how many sins of the spirit there are, into which the flesh does not enter. The most odious and the most fiendish of sins—falsehood, slander, hatred and revenge—are none of them sins of the flesh. With regard to his views of future retribution, Sir Richard says:

> "It is quite possible that Paul confined the vengeance of Jesus to those who had resisted his cause, or persecuted his followers, and that all others would be allowed to remain in their graves, not being raised for the purpose of reward or punishment, and as we have said, he looked forward to the ultimate restoration, or it may be the annihilation,* of those who might be raised in order to be punished. Nothing whatever in his writings suggests the idea that he believed evil and suffering to be as eternal in their nature as God himself, still less that the just Judge and merciful Father of mankind miraculously maintained a place of punishment for the never-ending torment of those who, from whatever cause, had fallen short of his favour. He would have recoiled from such a doctrine, and repudiated the notion that it was involved in his teaching; for he was not a man to be bound in logical fetters, or to follow out his reasoning to conclusions that conflicted with the deepest instincts of his nature. For consider, he believed and taught that Christ was to re-appear in his lifetime. * * * He would have accepted the formula that God hates sin, but loves the sinner, but would not have drawn from this the modern orthodox conclusion that God practically exhibits the very opposite sentiments; proving His love for sin by constituting a world in which it is to subsist and to flourish eternally, and His hatred for the sinner by keeping him alive for ever in that world."—*Paul and the Primitive Church, c. 352-3.*

The limitations both of the extent and the duration of the world, as they appeared to Paul, would have made even the everlasting punishment of all unbelievers a less tremendous catastrophe than it appears to us, but we have no reason to infer that he even thought of such a thing. The Gospel which he preached was good news, not the very worst possible, which has been preached in his name.

---

* 1 Thessalonians, i. 9. Galatians, vi. 8. 1 Corinthians, iii. 16.

> "It has always been the opinion of the great thinkers of the Church, that the number of the lost very far exceeds that of the saved. At present in Protestant Churches there is rather a reaction against this doctrine even among the rigidly orthodox, and the ranks of the redeemed are swelled by those of the heathen who have never heard of the name of Jesus, and of infants who have not committed actual sin. And yet, these same persons, with amiable inconsistency, organise missions to the heathen and seek to diminish the destruction of infant life.—*Jesus of History*, *396 note.*

I recollect well in my own youth reading in one of Mrs. Sherwood's books, then the most popular religious literature of the day, how the "Lady of the Manor" comforts one of her young lady pupils, who is lamenting the small number of those who would be saved, by bidding her recollect the provision made by God for peopling heaven, by the large numbers of those who died in infancy. I could not then see the slander on the Creator implied in this assertion, that this world with all its order and beauty and opportunities of usefulness, was such a failure that only those who had been withdrawn from its discipline had any reasonable chance of escape from unutterable and eternal misery; and next to the wish that I had never been born at all, arose the wish that I had been born a heathen or died a baby.

Augustine, Luther, Calvin, and others have built firm logical structures on what they supposed to be Paul's foundations. His doctrine of election—propounded to satisfy his natural questioning as to why God had cast off His own people and called the Gentiles, and which he illustrated by the parallel case of Jacob and Esau—has hardened into the Calvinistic doctrine of election and reprobation. His personal and temporary views as to marriage have peopled monasteries and nunneries and anchorite cells for seventeen hundred years. His opposition between flesh and spirit has been translated into the absolute inborn depravity of human nature, demanding the repression of all the natural instincts of humanity; while his doctrine of justification by faith, and not by works of the Jewish law, has led to relaxation of morals and presumptuous antinomianism.

In Sir Richard's opinion, Paul was probably an innovator in the matter of the Lord's Supper. The disciples at first seem to have commemorated their Master in the breaking of bread at every meal which they partook of, and there is no mention of the cup. Paul says (1 Cor., xi. 23,*et seq.*): "I received of the Lord Jesus that which I delivered unto you," and gives word for word the account of the institution which is in the three first Gospels, as if he had it by immediate revelation; and he objects to the Corinthian converts making an ordinary meal of the ordinance, though that appears to have been the practice in the earlier Church. That erroneous idea which we had in childhood that because the Gospels come first in the New Testament therefore they were first written, misleads us much; and it is possible that if the order of Paul was observed in the Church at the time the Gospels were reduced to their present form, his formula would be regarded as the original one, and be incorporated in them.

> "If the author of the Acts had foreseen a time when his writings and those of Paul would be bound up together in a handy form and circulated by millions throughout the world as being both of them divinely inspired and infallibly true, he would not have told the legend of the heavenly vision of Peter, and the voice which said, "Rise, Peter, kill and eat, for what God hath cleansed call thou not common"; or of his first preaching to Cornelius, and then baptising him without a word about circumcision; which aggravates the charge made against him by Paul (in Galatians), of weakness and deception."

The author of the Acts meant to reconcile all parties in the Church, and to show the unanimity of its leaders from the earliest times, and if only Acts had remained extant, he might have succeeded.

As to the rapid spread of the Gospel, which has been considered the strongest proof of the miraculous origin of Christianity, there were many favouring circumstances of time and place, and the very changes that were made in the original doctrines and practices, to accommodate them to the needs and the ideas of the various orders of mind through which it forced its way, made it grow mightily and prevail.

> "By destroying national independence, the Roman successes had weakened the feeling of reverence to the national gods. * * * The ground had been broken up for the reception of new ideas; there was no longer anything in political life anywhere to absorb the intellect or occupy energy. * * * The slave torn from his home and family, the patriot who had no longer a country, the peasant whose crops had been destroyed, the merchant whose stores had been pillaged, the philosopher whose dreams of the dominion of virtue were rudely dispelled by the triumph of the baser forms of vice, found each something appropriate in the offer of a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens, of a better country, even a heavenly, of a Kingdom into which

nothing that is defiled should enter, of treasures that were secure against violence and decay, of a rest that no toil disturbs, of a joy that no sorrow should trouble."—*Jesus of History*, 384.

The persecution that Christianity met with was intermittent, and generally confined to particular localities. Nothing like the concentrated, continuous, far-reaching persecution of the Inquisition, was ever directed against it, nor should we blame indiscriminately those who looked on it as a superstition or misjudged the aims of its followers.

We may conclude this paper with what Sir Richard Hanson says of Gallio, who "cared for none of those things."

"Had he listened to Paul, he might have been struck with his views of God and duty, yet it is quite possible that his own were as pure and as elevated. No doubt he saw before him a portion of the first development of a faith that was destined to sap the foundations of Roman greatness, and to efface almost every vestige of ancient civilization, without a suspicion of its latent power and ultimate fortunes. But this ignorance was inevitable. Of the myriad voices that are now soliciting the popular ear, who can foresee which one or whether any will find an echo in the heart of posterity, or can be rightly blamed by future writers for having failed to do so? Judging from the analogy of the past, however, we may be tolerably certain of two things with regard to that which is successful:—one, that it will not be the voice which an impartial bystander would deem most deserving of success; and the other, that it will have so changed by contact with the actualities of life as to make its identity barely recognizable; not more, perhaps, than the ceremonies of the holy torch at Rome are with the simple breaking of bread in their own houses of the first disciples." —*Paul and the Primitive Church*, 206-7.

C. H. SPENCE.

ABEL JANSEN TASMAN.

A NOTE.

THE seventeenth century may be called the Century of Companies. The English, the French, the Spaniards, and the Dutch seem almost simultaneously to have recognised the great principle of co-operation in the furtherance of commercial enterprise. In the year 1600 Queen Elizabeth granted to certain merchants of the city of London a charter to trade to the East Indies, reserving to them all rights and privileges and constituting them a body corporate. This charter was the foundation of that great power subsequently known as John Company. Eleven years afterwards Gerard le Roy, an adventurer of daring and genius, obtained a similar privilege for the French. Still later, the Emperor Charles VI. created at Ostend a commission known as the Imperial Company, which died, strangled in its birth by political intrigue; while the Danes, under Christian IV., established a trading company in 1612.

The Co-Operative Society that at present concerns us, however, is that of the Dutch. The greed of Philip of Spain strove to secure to himself all the commerce of these magnificent islands of the Pacific to which the daring spirits of the old world were hastening. Philip knew that a monopoly of trade was the first step to universal empire. He seized upon the passage into the Baltic, hoping to become master of the commerce of the North. He intended to build a city at the Straits of Magellan, and there establish such a colony as might, to use the words of old Harris, "put it out of the power of other Nations to trouble the Commerce of the South Seas, or find a passage that way to the Indies." Now Philip's revolted subjects in the Netherlands had already begun to make a figure in trade; and the instant that Spain mastered Portugal, she forbade the Dutch to purchase those commodities of the East which by their commerce with Lisbon they had hitherto procured and advantageously spread over Europe. This prohibition created men like Tasman, and made the Dutch lords of the Indies.

The merchants of Amsterdam, taking into consideration the profits already made by the English, who had run successfully the Spanish blockade, resolved to open for themselves a passage to these countries from which they were so contemptuously excluded. In 1595 they organised a co-operative offensive and defensive society, called The

Company for Remote Countries. The proceedings of the captains employed by this first company savour of the piratical. Stephen Van der Hagen, the gallant Heemskirk, and the dashing Oliver van Noort, did not stick at trifles. They were on the decks of their own ships, and woe betide any adventurous Spaniard or Portuguese who crossed the range of their cannon. The ships of the Hague merchants were little better than subsidised privateers, and it was not until, by repeated battles, they had established a claim to settlement and trade, that the great East Indian Company of the Netherlands can be regarded as respectably existent. The first charter was dated 20th March, 1602, and was to continue for twenty-one years. The second charter was granted on the year that the former expired, and terminated in 1644. The third terminated on the 7th February, 1665. The company obtained five charters in all, and in lieu of the fifth, which expired in 1717, procured from the States-General a monopoly of trade within the limits of the original charter, thus making themselves not only masters of the rich commerce of Java, but absolute monarchs of Batavia and the smaller islands of the East.

To understand precisely the position which the subject of this Note held when he first became worthy of record in contemporary history, we must take a rapid survey of the condition and economy of the settlements of the Company. The Government was carried on by a Governor-General and Council, who had their head-quarters at Amboyna. Banda, Malacca, Ceylon, and Cochin were ruled by Lieutenant-Governors, who reported directly to head-quarters at Batavia. The Governor-General and his Council were specially instructed from Holland to use the ships at their disposal in the exploration of the adjoining seas, and when the captains of the Dutch-Indian fleet were not chasing Spaniards or subjugating refractory chiefs, they were cruising about the unknown waters of the South Seas, in obedience to the orders of the Governor. Now, in 1642, that astute and ambitious man, General Antony Van Diemen, was Governor of Batavia, and one of his most trusted captains was a Hollander of obscure birth, known as Abel Jansen Tasman.

It is remarkable that the Dutch biographers have neglected to record particulars of the life of their countryman. Notwithstanding the magnitude and importance of his discoveries, his name is but briefly mentioned in the history of the settlements of Dutch India. Nothing is said of his birth or death. The narrative of his first voyage only survives, and that but by the accident that Valentyn, the historian, and author of the notable Omstanding Verbaal van de Geschiedenissen en Zaaken, had married into the family of the Secretary of Batavia, and obtained access to the neglected private journal of the navigator. Even this narrative is open to suspicion, for although the Dutch had treated Tasman with a neglect which was either contempt or policy, other nations had recognised the value of his explorations, and several accounts, each purporting to be the only correct one, had appeared in England and France. The editor of De Hondt's Collection of Voyages assèrts that he himself possessed the manuscript journal, though his transcript differs in many important particulars from that of Valentyn. An English translation from Dirk Rembrandt, published in London in 1711, again differs from the French of Thevenot, and the earlier translation (1682) in Dr. Hook's Philosophical Collection. In Dubois' standard work upon the lives of the great men of the Dutch-India, Les Vies de Gouverneurs Hollandois aux Indes Orientales, Tasman is dismissed with a paragraph in the life of Van Diemen, and no known book contains any record of his second voyage. I have taken the materials for the following brief account of his first voyage from Dalrymple's Voyages to the South Pacific Ocean, London, 1770, collating with Harris's Navigatiarum Bibliotheca, 1774, Thevenot, and the Terra Australis Cognita, published at Edinburgh in 1766. Dalrymple asserts that his narrative is a transcript of Valentyn's reprinted MSS., corrected by De Hondt's quarto, published at the Hague 1749; Thevenot's folio of 1663; Nashborough's Voyage, 1761; and Campbell's Navigatiarum et Itinerarum Bibliotheca—the London folio of 1744.

On the 14th August, 1642, Tasman sailed from Batavia with two vessels of the Company, the Heemskirk and the Zeehan (named, as are the two peaks which overlook Macquarie Harbour, after the two great adventurers who laid the foundation of the Dutch Empire in the South), his instructions being to discover the extent of that Australian continent which previous navigators had sighted. Touching at the Isle of France, he shaped his course south, then south-east, meeting with stormy weather. On the 22nd November, in latitude 42deg. 58min. S., the compass traversed eight points, so that they imagined themselves near some magnetic mines,; and on the 24th land was discovered ten miles distant, which Tasman named Van Diemen's Land, after the Governor-General.

Stress of weather drove them out to sea, and they did not attempt a landing until the 2nd of December. On that day, having anchored in Frederick Henry Bay, Francis Jacobez, the master of the Heemskirk, with a guard of four muskets, and attended by the purser of the Zeehan, went ashore to look for water. In three hours he returned without accident, and reported abundance of wood and water, but had seen no human being, hearing only a noise as of a gong at a little distance. Prudent Tasman waited all that day, observing from the ship smoke towards the W. by N., and "seeing plainly men of extraordinary size" moving along the shore. On the 3rd he attempted a landing on the east side of the bay, taking with him a boat's crew and six men. The surf being dangerous, the carpenter, Peter Jacobez, swam ashore, towing with him a pole and the Dutch flag. Making shift to set up this pole near four high trees, the new-found territory was formally taken possession of by the saturated carpenter; and two days after Tasman sailed to the East, thinking it not worth while to prosecute enquiries into the customs of the inhabitants.

Calculating his latitude and longitude by the new notation (east and west from the meridian of Greenwich) it would appear that the land first seen was Point Hibbs, and that had Tasman run up Storm Bay, he would have reached the present site of Hobart Town. In any case, if, instead of sailing out eastward, he had continued his course northerly about four degrees, he would have struck the continent some three degrees east of the present site of Melbourne, midway between Wilson's Promontory and Cape Howe, while less than a single degree north from his point of divergence would have brought him into the straits which divide Van Diemen's Land from Terra Australis, and anticipated the discovery of Bass. It is probable, however, that his instructions were so framed as to induce him to sail rather for the south, where it was believed existed islands as rich in spices as those of the Javan Archipelago.

On the 13th of December, in latitude 42deg. 10min. S, and longitude 178deg. 28min. E, he discovered a mountainous country which he named Staaten Land. He anchored in what he calls a fine bay, which was really the strait between the Northern and Middle Island of New Zealand. While thus at anchor a disturbance took place with the natives, who, approaching in their canoes, surrounded the two vessels. Seven canoes full of Maories, in war costume, lay off the Zeehan, and five canoes, each containing seventeen men, put off to the Heemskirk. Tasman describes the natives as of a colour between brown and yellow, their hair twisted on their heads after the fashion of the Japanese, and their bodies covered round the loins with a sort of mat. The plates in Dalrymple's works pourtray the natives as Maories. An affray took place in which the islanders upset the prawl of the Zeehan, killing three men, and forcing the others to swim for their lives. The weather being rough, Tasman thought it prudent to depart without risking further combat; so, naming the ill-omened spot Murderers Bay, he sailed to the eastward.

Here, again, the Dutchman was on the point of anticipating the discovery of Cook's Straits. He sailed to the north to Three Kings Island, latitude 34deg. 25min. S., and longitude 172 deg. 40min., naming a cape to the eastward (the north-west coast of Auckland) Maria van Diemen, in honor of the daughter of the Governor-General. In stress for provisions, he sailed north for the islands of Cocos and Hoorn (discovered by Schouten in 1616) for a supply of food. After passing a rock, which, from the abundance of its fowl, he named High Pylstaarts Island, he sighted on the 21st of January, 1643, two of the Friendly Islands called Amsterdam and Middleburg, the inhabitants of which brought pigs and poultry. The navigators went ashore and held a festival. Tasman gives a picturesque description of his reception by the King, which I regret I have not space to quote. I regret still more I cannot reproduce the fantastic and charming illustration of the Harbour of Amsterdam Island, and the bird's-eye view of the anchored fleet lying outside the palisaded and populous town. On the first of February was discovered the Islands of Prince William; and on the 22nd an easterly trade wind in latitude 5deg. 2min. S., and longitude 178 deg. 32min. E, brought the explorer in sight of the group of islands called Ontong-Java by Le Maire, and set down by him as 90 miles from New Guinea. From thence Tasman sailed to New Britain, which he erroneously called New Guinea, and passing by Seram-Bourg and Boston, arrived at Batavia on the 15th of June, having accomplished his voyage in ten months. A map of his discoveries was sent to Amsterdam.

As I have said before, no complete memoir exists of the second voyage of Tasman, though there is little doubt but that it was more important in its results than the first one. Mr. Major supposes that the records of the journey were purposely destroyed. There is reason for this supposition, for the Company were unreasonably jealous of the progress made by its West India rival, and carefully locked up all charts which might give aid to foreign mariners adventuring into those seas which it regarded as its own. The works from which the historians of the Netherlands-Indies compiled their works were few in number. Almost all that was publicly known concerning the discoveries of the Batavian Governors was to be found in Thevenot's folio of 1663-72; the Nord en Oost Tartarye of Witsen, 1692-1705; Valentyn's Oud en Nieuw Oost Indien, 1724-26; Inleidning tot de Algemeen Geographie, by Nicolas Struyk, 1740, and the celebrated Book of Despatches, quoted by Flinders in the introduction to his Voyages.

In this last-named work the instructions to Tasman for his second voyage in 1644 is set down with a phlegmatic and tradesmanlike caution, which is interesting to contemplate. No ardour for knowledge, no love of discovery for discovery's sake, stirred the mercantile soul of the Company. Tasman was to put up signs of possession on such countries as he might discover, by planting European trees, and carving the arms of the Netherlands and the Company upon posts, stones, and rocks. He was to institute trade with the natives, but to keep them ignorant of the value of the precious metals, showing samples of tin, lead, or pewter, as of more value than gold. He was to bring home specimens of everything likely to be of mercantile value, and to make treaties with the natives which should exclude in trading transactions all other nations but the Dutch. He was to make drawings and descriptions of the bays, rivers, and capes, for which purpose a draughtsman accompanied him, and he was desired to note most carefully the latitude, longitude, and prevailing currents of wind. His sailing directions were as follow :—He was to proceed to Amboyna and Banda, thence by Tenimber, Key, and Aroun, to Point Ture, on the south coast of New Guinea. From that place he was to continue eastward to 9deg. south latitude, and endeavour to ascertain if within the great inlet of Spratts River there is not an entrance into the South Sea. Thence he was to coast along New Guinea to the farthest known spots in 17deg. south latitude, and follow the coast despite all opposing winds, in order that he might be assured "if this land be divided from the Great South Continent or not." If he found that the Great South Continent was so divided, his instructions were to circumnavigate the island; but if, as the Council believed, no opening existed between New Guinea and New Holland, Tasman was to run down to the north coast to south latitude 22deg., proceed to Houtmans Abrolhos, fish up a chest of dollars lost in Pelsaart's wreck, and pick up the two sailors who had been marooned there for participation in the mutiny which followed upon that occurrence. If the weather did not permit him to go to Houtman's Abrolhos, he was to complete the coast exploration of Arnhem and Van Diemen's Lands, and return by Java and the Straits of Sunda.

So Tasman departed some time in January, 1644, with three ships, the Limmen, the Zeemeuw, and the Brak, and disappeared out of human history.

I think that there can be no doubt but that the cool-headed navigator fulfilled his mission with honour and credit, and brought back numerous drawings and plants. These, together with his charts and plans, were carefully concealed, perhaps eventually even destroyed, by the Company. The only fragment of anything which looks like an authentic record is some four paragraphs of a journal published in 1705 by Witsen, and purporting to have been written by Tasman. These paragraphs are understood to refer to Papua, though the latitude is given 17deg. 12min. South, and the longitude 121deg. East. It is more than probable that the assumption of Burgomaster Witsen is unwarranted. Better evidence of Tasman's fortune are the maps of 1648-60. In the same year (1648) in which the map of Australia was inscribed in the floor of the Stadshouse in Amsterdam, Louis Mayerne Turquet published at Paris a mappemonde, which is evidently based upon observations similar to those which Tasman was directed to make. So in the Mar di India, in the edition of Jansen's atlas in 1650, in the atlas of Klencke, of Amsterdam, and in the sixteenth chart of Thevenot's Relation de Divers Voyages Curieux (1663), distinct reference is made to discoveries which it is most reasonable to suppose were made by Tasman. In one of the early maps of Van Keulen a portion of Tasman's track, with soundings, is given, and in the British Museum is a chart which Mr. Major regards as an absolute copy of Tasman's own. If this be so, it is tolerably clear that Tasman missed the discovery that New Guinea and New Holland were separated by sea, and that taking the alternative his instructions afforded him, he sounded down the Gulf of Carpentaria, continued sounding all the way to De Witts's Land, and then returned in a direct line north-west for Java.

So ends all that is at present known of a man who was, without doubt, an adventurous explorer, a prudent commander, and a skilful navigator. That he did not leave a larger memory is due to the system which created him—a system which cultivated human sponges to be filled, squeezed, and thrown away.

MARCUS CLARKE.

SHAKSPERE: THE LIFE AND THE PLAYS.*

How can these contrarieties agree?—HENRY VI. ii. 8.

THERE are some subjects of which the reading public seems never to tire. One of these subjects is Shakspere. That great World-Poet and World-Teacher, who held for us "the mirror up to Nature," has so endeared himself to his disciples that they seem never weary of the theme. And it is no small proof of the esteem in which he is held that the interest felt in him and in those great works in which his teaching is embodied has not been lessened by the over-zealous endeavours of some of his friends. Although, as Schlegel says, the books that have been written about him form in themselves no inconsiderable library, any fresh revelation, or any new criticism, if appreciative, meets with a ready welcome. The latest contribution to the subiect comes to us from America. The question has been there raised, not indeed for the first time, but with unusual force and fulness of discussion, whether the internal evidence which the plays afford as to the character and acquirements of their author can be reconciled with the known facts of Shakspere's life. We propose, therefore, to state some of the leading difficulties which a comparison of these two kinds of evidence suggests.

William Shakspere was born at Stratford-on-Avon on the 23rd of April, 1564. He attended the Free Grammar School there for a few years; but in 1578 he was removed, in order to assist his father, who was then in "narrow circumstances," in his business, whether of butcher, glover, or wool stapler. Withdrawn from his studies at this early age (for we know how small is the progress made by a boy of fourteen, even with the best advantages), we cannot wonder at the general testimony of his contemporaries as to his want of learning, nor at Ben Jonson's allusion to his "small Latin and less (in another edition 'no') Greek." Beyond what he was taught at this school; he seems to have had no instruction whatever. Of the eight following years of his life we have no positive knowledge, but tradition represents him as working at some one of the trades above mentioned. When not quite nineteen, he married the daughter of a neighbouring farmer, eight years older than himself. It is needless to repeat the stories about the deer-stealing, and his troubles with Sir Thomas Lucy. All that we can assert positively is that whether from that, or from some other motive, he emigrated from Stratford to London. Here he arrived in 1586; and, considering the kind of life he seems to have been leading previously, it is not surprising that he brought with him nothing but his own native abilities. The tradition that he began his career as a link-boy is generally disallowed; but it is certain that he was connected with the theatre in some humble capacity. He improved his position, however, by degrees; since after a period of obscurity we find him re-appearing as an actor and a dramatist. In 1598 he is mentioned by Meres (Palladis Tamia) as the author of several plays, and he appears also to have attained some eminence as an actor. Notwithstanding the calls that such employments made upon his time, he was not neglectful of his business affairs; for scattered notices in contemporary records represent him as "procuring monei for his countrymen"; "bargening" about "such warys as might be sold presentlye with profet"; and "disbursing monei upon some od yarde or other att Shottri."* In 1604 he appears to have become a shareholder in the Globe and Blackfriars, and to have taken an active part in the management; from this date till 1613 he seems also to have been actively engaged in different business transactions, "purchasing houses, lands, and tithes; bringing suits against Philip Rogers for malt delivered, and against John Addenbrook for money loaned; and executing commissions in London for his Stratford neighbours." In 1613 he left London, and passed the remainder of his life, according to Rowe, "in ease, retirement, and the conversation of his friends," concerning himself apparently about subjects of no higher interest than the enclosing of certain waste lands. He died in 1616, conscientiously discharging his business affairs to the last, and neglectful only of one point, viz., the collecting and editing of his plays; for while his contemporaries, Ben Jonson, and Beaumont and Fletcher, published editions of their plays during their lifetime, the first edition of Shakspere's collected works did not appear until seven years after his death. The main features of his life, as thus presented by the diligent labour of his editors and biographers, display a not uncommon character. A young man who falls into difficulties in his native town, comes to London, earns a competence, if not a fortune, by his abilities and industry, returns to his home, and there spends the remainder of his days; the story is one that might be told of hundreds both before and after Shakspere's time.

---

* The Authorship of Shakespeare, by Judge Holmes: New York, Hurd and Haughton.

---

* Dyce 54, &c.

His biographers seem to feel the ungrateful nature of their task, and turn eagerly from the barren and worthless details of the life to the priceless treasure that awaits them in the plays.

Between the years 1594 and 1616 no fewer than forty-three plays were published under the name or initials of William Shakspere. Of these it has been proved that six (including the three initialled) were not his composition; they seem to have been merely issued under his name, as belonging to his theatre, and acted by his company. The remaining thirty-seven plays remain a lasting monument to the genius of their author. He was indeed no ordinary mortal who composed, in the intervals of business, works like these, surpassing in power and beauty all that the world has yet seen; and that too with such ease and fluency, that his first editors can assert "We scarce ever received a blot in his papers."

For a long time it was the fashion to speak of these works as "pleasing with a certain wild and native eloquence," and of their author as "a rude and barbarous genius." This curiously mistaken theory reached its culmination in the infamous saying of Voltaire, that "Hamlet" was "the work of a drunken savage."* The force of folly or of wilful blindness could no further go, and a reaction speedily set in. The labours of many, especially of German critics, have taught us to appreciate more nearly at its true value that marvellous work; and at the same time have changed the mere "wonder and astonishment" felt in Milton's time at the utterances apparently of inspiration to a more rational admiration of the powers, acquired as well as natural, that appear in the plays.

Of the author's natural genius, displayed, as it has been, so fully and so frequently to the world by his innumerable critics, it would be unnecessary and presumptuous in us to speak. We wish now to draw attention to those accomplishments possessed by him which genius and intuition cannot supply, but which must be acquired by patient labour and study. The first of these that presents itself, viz., the amount of his classical learning, is a point that has caused much discussion. Dr. Farmer, who advocated the theory of "small Latin and less Greek," showed clearly enough that where possible he used translations. This may readily be granted; and touches indeed but a small part of the question. By many of those most fit to judge† it is considered that traces of classical learning and an intimate acquaintance with Greek and Latin authors appear in the plays. A remarkable testimony to this is to be found also in the fact that Mr. J. F. Boyes, when collecting passages from various English poets for "illustrations of the tragedies of Œschylus and Sophocles," met with more striking parallels in Shakspere's works alone than in those of Shirley, Ford, Massinger, and Jonson together. "His points of similarity," adds Mr. Boyes,* "are so many and so striking, that either we must allow him to have been not merely a scholar, but a most extensive one . . . . Or these resemblances deserve to be accounted for, if possible, in some other manner." Judge Holmes is of opinion that the author of the Plays "drew materials, ideas, and even expressions from the tragedies of Sophocles and Euripides, and even from Plato, no less than from the Latin of Ovid, Virgil, Horace, Seneca, and Tacitus" (p. 10). The Comedy of Errors is pronounced by the same authority to be little more than a reproduction in a different dress of the Menœchmi of Plautus. This resemblance has been before observed by Schlegel and others. Mr. Knight, who with Ben Jonson in his mind writes very guardedly, says that the play "undoubtedly presents evidence of Shakspere's ability to read Latin." "The speech of Ægeon, in the first scene,

---

* Letters to the Academy, 1776.

† Malone, Steevens, Theobald, Knight, White, &c.

> 'A heavier task could not have been imposed
> Than I to speak my griefs unspeakable,'

is an imitation of the

> 'Infandum regina, jubes renovare dolorem'

of Virgil. 'Thou art an elm, my husband, I a vine' is in Catullus, Ovid, and Horace; and the metaphor is not one likely to present itself to the mind of an untravelled and unlettered Englishman. The 'owls that suck our breath' are the 'striges' of Ovid. The apostrophe of Dromio to the virtues of 'beating' is modelled upon Cicero. The burning of the conjuror's beard is an incident copied from the the twelfth book of Virgil's Œneid. Lastly, in the original copy of the Comedy of Errors the Antipholus of Ephesus is called Sereptus, a corruption of the epithet by which one of the twin-brothers in Plautus is distinguished, 'Menœchmus Surreptus.' Mr Knight further reminds us of the well-known passage in Hamlet, "Seneca cannot be too heavy, nor Plautus too light;" and adds, "the criticism is decisive as to his familiarity with the originals."

With regard to his knowledge of Greek, the "Timon of Athens" furnishes the strongest evidence. This play has been a great stumbling-block to the commentators from the difficulty of assigning to it any probable source. Various attempts have been made to show that it was founded on the story in North's Plutarch, or on some of the popular tales of the day, but all were alike unsuccessful. It was only of late years that Lucian's Timon was suggested as having had some influence over the composition of the Timon of Athens. The following are some of the points of resemblance which Mr Knight has traced between the work of the Greek satirist and that of the English dramatist; the full description of the false friends of Timon; the finding by Timon of great sums of gold which he had dug up in the woods (this was noticed by Malone also); his rejection of the treasure; the likeness of the poet in the play to the flatterer who came with the new ode; and the visit of the senators. To these coincidences it may perhaps be added that Timon's recollection (in the Dialogue) of the flatterer "who alone when all the others were silent praised my singing" may be compared with Apemantus' advice (in the Play) to "praise his most vicious strain and call it excellent;" while the allusion in Lucian's Timon of offering a halter to one who asked alms may, not impossibly, have suggested the famous invitation of the Timon in the Play to his "loving countrymen" who had sent to beg his assistance, that each should "come hither ere my tree hath felt the axe, and hang himself." The Timon of the Play is a conception of its author's own, and the whole work is, of course, by no means a mere imitation of the Greek satirist; but there are evident traces that the Dialogue of Lucian was not unknown to the author of the play; and as there was in the time of Shakspere no translation of Lucian published, it follows that if he read the dialogue at all he must have read it in the original.*

---

* Illustrations, &c., p. xxiv.

From all this evidence then we may conclude the author of the Plays to have been a scholar of no mean classical attainments. That he was acquainted also with French, Italian, and Spanish, may be seen by considering the sources whence he obtained the plots of his plays. Many of them are based on old Italian stories. The diligence of the commentators has discovered, though with much difference of opinion, translations of most; but some from which he drew materials either for his plots, incidents, or characters, were at the time he wrote untranslated. The story of Much Ado about Nothing is taken, says Pope, from Ariosto. Mr. Dyce recognises some very important incidents of the play in an Italian novel by Bandello; of which no English translation can be found, though there was a French version of it. The model for the serious parts of Twelfth Night was, according to Mr. Hunter, "an Italian comedy, entitled Gl' Ingannati, and its title, he believes, was suggested by a phrase occurring in a long prologue prefixed to the Italian play, "La Notte di Beffana." The story of Othello is generally allowed to have been taken, perhaps through the medium of a French translation, from Cinthio's Hecatommithie; and the story of Proteus and Julia, in the Two Gentlemen of Verona, from a Spanish novel, "Diana," by Montemayor. The character of Ancient Pistol, in Henry V., Mr. Ward considers to be modelled on one of the favourite comic types on the Spanish stage.

---

* There was a certain old play, modelled on Lucian's dialogue, which some of the commentators believe may have suggested the "Timon of Athens;" but Mr. Dyce, into whose possession the MS. of the old play came, says, "That Shakspere had any acquaintance with it I much doubt; for it certainly never was performed in London, being intended solely for the amusement of an academic audience."

The part that next attracts our attention in the plays is the evidence they present of legal learning. This was first observed by Mr. Collier; and Lord Campbell was so impressed by it that he devoted an essay to the subject. Speaking of the "judicial phrases and forensic allusions" to be found in the plays, he observes, "On the retrospect I am amazed not only by their number, but by the accuracy and propriety with which they are uniformly introduced." He points out that "All's Well that Ends Well," proves its author to have had "an accurate knowledge of the law of England respecting the incidents of military tenure;" and that in "Henry VI." (Part 2) there is evidence of "a full and accurate knowledge of that rather obscure and intricate subject, felony, and benefit of clergy." But perhaps the most remarkable instance occurs in Hamlet. Lord Campbell is of opinion that the author of this play "must have read and studied Plowden's report of the celebrated case of Hales v. Petit." If a comparison be made between the speeches of the learned counsel in that case, and the discussion of the grave-diggers, as to whether the drowned Ophelia shall have "Christian burial," it will be seen that the witty nonsense spoken by the clowns is simply a travesty of the profoundly learned and ingenious arguments of the lawyers. It would require surely no slight acquaintance with law for a writer so to possess himself of the spirit of a grave and difficult case as to disentangle and turn into matter for ridicule the parts that amused him. Judge Holmes, moreover, refers to the "Merchant of Venice" for evidence that its author "knew the exact difference between law and equity," nay, that his knowledge extended even to Chancery practice; and he quotes the words of Portia:—

> "Let us go in,
> And charge us there upon int'rogatories,
> And we will answer all things faithfully."

Lines which no poet would have written had he not been conscious that the words were absolutely the right ones for the occasion, and must be used. "For the *charges, int'rogatories,* and *answer* had to come in, though the syllables should prove somewhat refractory for musical verse."* It would be to no purpose further to accumulate evidence, and we may fairly accept the conclusion of Lord Campbell that the author of the plays, whoever or whatever else he may have been, was at all events "an accomplished jurist."

That this same author was skilled also in natural science was allowed even by Pope, and could not fail to be observed by all readers, were it not that the beauty of the various illustrations and metaphors in which this knowledge is embodied, at first distract the attention. Again, some critics have discovered in the plays evidence of a close acquaintance with medical science. A few years ago an American critic made the suggestion that Shakspere had anticipated Harvey in his discovery of the circulation of the blood, basing his opinion on certain passages in the plays. The controversy to which this gave rise had the effect of proving that though the "immortal dramatist" had not made this discovery, he had, nevertheless, "read widely in medical literature," and "had paid an amount of attention to subjects of medical interest, little, if at all, inferior to that which he must have devoted to law."† In a book entitled "The Psychology of Shakspere," Dr. Bucknill expresses the opinion that "abnormal conditions of mind had attracted the author's diligent observation, and had been his favourite study." Schlegel also has noticed this. "Of all the poets," he observes, "he perhaps alone has portrayed mental diseases, melancholy, delirium, lunacy, with such inexpressible, and in every respect definite truth, that the physician may enrich his observation from them as from real cases."‡

Few persons will deny that this "great poet" was also, as Coleridge says, a great philosopher. The opinions of his celebrated critics, of Goethe, of Schiller, of Jean Paul Richter, of Schlegel, of Coleridge, and of Heraud are sufficient proof. We have only, then, to bear in mind the depth of thought and the extent of mental culture required in a philosopher, and we cannot fail to call it, with Pope, "perfectly amazing in a man of no education or experience;" though we may not agree with that critic in his very new opinion—

---

* Holmes, p. 637.

† Shakspere's Medical Knowledge, by J. C. Bucknill; quoted by Holmes, p. 18.

‡ Dramatic Literature, p. 365.

"that the philosopher, and even the man of the world, may be *born* as well as the poet." But besides that philosophy of his own, in which, as some of his critics say, he anticipated many of the discoveries of the 19th century, passages in the plays prove him to have been acquainted with the schemes of philosophers of old. Thus in the "Taming of the Shrew" (I., 1) Lucentio says—

For the time I study
Virtue, and that part of philosophy
Will I apply that treats of happiness
By virtue specially to be achieved.

And Tranio answers:

Mi perdonate, gentle master, mine.
I am in all affected as yourself;
Glad that you thus continue your resolve
To suck the sweets of sweet philosophy.
Only, good master, while we do admire
This virtue, and this moral discipline,
Let's be no stoics, nor no stocks, I pray;
Nor so devote to Aristotle's checks,
As Ovid be an outcast quite abjured, &c.

And in "Troilus and Cressida," Hector reproves Paris and Troilus for having spoken—

Not much
Unlike young men whom Aristotle thought
Unfit to hear moral philosophy.

In his supposition that the philosopher and even the man of the world might be *born* as well as the poet, Pope might have included the courtier also. For in these plays we have distinct evidence of their author's acquaintance with "the perfumed air of courts." How feelingly he speaks of "the courtly and fashionable" mode of promising without performing! with what an air of experience he discourses of

"The art of the court
As hard to leave as keep; whose top to climb
Is certain falling, or so slippery that
The fear's as bad as falling."—(*Cymbeline* iii. 3)!

But above all how life-like a series of pictures he has left us of the courtiers of his time: of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern; of Osric; of Amiens and Jaques, of Parolles and Lafeu; and of the "popinjay lord" who pestered fiery Hotspur, smarting with his wounds. All his pictures of court life and of courtiers have that air of reality about them that personal experience alone gives. In Love's Labour's Lost we recognise, as Heraud points out, in the roles of Boyet and of Biron, "a courtier-like acquaintance with things courtly." This play was one of the author's earliest, and is generally allowed to have been written in 1589, three years after Shakspere's arrival in London. It was from this comedy that Coleridge inferred that Shakspere's habits had been scholastic and those of a student; "for a young author's first work," he continued, "almost always bespeaks his recent pursuits, and his first observations of life are drawn from the immediate employments of his youth, and from the characters and images most deeply impressed on his mind in the situations in which those employments had placed him." According to this principle, therefore, from the "ostentatious display of classical lore" in the comedy, we may infer that its author's recent pursuits had been those of a student; while from the company to which we are introduced, the "merry mocking lords," the "refined traveller of Spain," the

> Trencher knights that know the trick
> To make my lady laugh when she's disposed ;

and from the language used, the "Taffeta phrases and silken terms precise," and the frequent occurrence of French and Italian words, we may not unfairly suppose that the immediate employments of his youth had been those of a courtier in France. That he had travelled, or at least had made a sea voyage, seems highly probable. We are told on good authority* that all the nautical terms used in the first act of the "Tempest" are perfectly correct; and that a knowledge of the new improvements, as well as of the doubtful points of seamanship, is evinced. This cannot have been learned from books, as there were none at that time published on the subject.

From the internal evidence of the plays, then, their author appears to have been "a scholar, and a ripe and good one;" a lawyer well versed in his profession, an admirable philosopher; a man of extensive reading and general information; and one who had travelled, had seen cities and men, and was acquainted with the inner life of courts. To suppose that all or any of this knowledge came by intuition would be simply absurd; it remains then to consider what opportunities Shakspere had for acquiring it. That he was no scholar may be set down as certain, since, besides the improbabilities arising from the nature of his education, we have also the distinct evidence of his contemporaries on the subject. To account for his legal learning, some critics have suggested that after leaving school he became a clerk in an attorney's office. For this hypothesis, as Lord Campbell points out, there is no external evidence whatever, and it must be treated, therefore, merely as conjecture, worthy of no more attention than Aubrey's suggestion, that he had been a schoolmaster; or Dr. Bucknill's, that he devoted himself to medical studies. Nor is there any evidence, apart from the Plays, that he had read much or widely. The only tradition preserved of him at this time—the deer-stealing episode, and his connection with the players whom he accompanied to London—certainly point to a love of adventure rather than of study. Mr. Armytage Brown's belief—based on passages in the Plays—that he had travelled, is unsupported, as Mr. Dyce points out, by any evidence; and the opinion of another critic, that he was "one of the brightest ornaments of Elizabeth's court," is assigned by Mr. Ward* to the realm of fiction. Had he been so, he must, as we have seen, have acquired his knowledge within three years of his absconding from Stratford. All these baseless suggestions have their origin in the attempt to harmonise the discord that exists between the Plays and the Life; and, except as marking this discord, are unworthy of attention. It is not only that there is no positive evidence to support them, but they are inconsistent with the facts which we actually know of Shakspere's life. Of his mode of life before coming to London we have already spoken. On his arrival there he entered almost immediately upon a laborious and difficult profession, which must have left him little time and less opportunity either for attendance at Elizabeth's court, for study and reading, or for conversing, as Lord Mulgrave supposes, with sea captains to learn the use of nautical terms. The scanty leisure that he possessed, he devotes, as we have seen, to his own and his neighbours' business affairs. Our knowledge then of the writer of the plays as furnished by his works, differs materially from that furnished by his life. It has been found impossible to bring the two into harmony. Either therefore the facts of his life are false, or the man who lived that life did not write the plays. But the facts, so far as they go, are undisputed. Only one conclusion then remains, viz.: that the plays were not written by their reputed author, William Shakspere.

---

* Lord Mulgrave, who had been a captain in the Royal Navy. Notes on the "Tempest" in Chambers's and Carruther's Shakspere.

Nor is this conclusion so rash as it may at first sight appear. The external evidence of Shakspere's authorship consists of two parts: first, the fact that his name was always attached to and associated with the plays; and second, that he was mentioned as their author by contemporaries, as Ben Jonson, Meres, Weever, Chettle, and John Davies.

---

* History of English Dramatic Literature, Vol. I.

The former circumstance, according to Mr. Ward (who yet does not deny Shakspere's authorship), has little or no weight. At that time it was not an uncommon practice for the booksellers to attach some popular name to books "for sale sake." If Shakspere was not the author of the plays, he was at least their owner; and in that sense they might be called his. The possibility that this may have been his connection with them is strengthened by the fact that three plays published under his name, and during his lifetime, are now known not to have been his composition; nor does he appear to have offered any objection to his name being there used. If he is known to have been so accommodating in a few instances, why not in all?

The second point proves not that the plays *were* Shakspere's, but that they were alleged and supposed to be so. The claim raises only a presumption, which may be rebutted. If the real author wished to remain concealed, and if Shakspere himself did not disown the works, it is not surprising that his contemporaries should have considered them as his. It is not perhaps very generally known that when "George Eliot's" earlier works appeared, they were commonly attributed to a gentleman who had already written a little under the same *nom-de-plume*. The gentleman did not himself deny the soft impeachment; and had thegreat authoress chosen not to make herself known, the few intimate friends who knew the truth would, no doubt, have concealed it in deference to her wish. The gentleman to whom they were attributed might have been considered throughout his life as the author of the novels; and centuries after his death critics, perhaps, would have been puzzling over the "contrarieties" between the life and the works of the modern Shakspere. If this be so in the present day, when so much of the private life of every popular writer is known to the world, how much more easily might it have been in the time of Shakspere!

If this contention be well founded, the question then naturally arises, who wrote Shakspere's Plays? There are some cases in which it is wise to confess our ignorance; and this is one of them. Some names have indeed been suggested with greater or less degree of probability; but before we embarrass ourselves with this difficult and doubtful problem, we must be clear upon the preliminary point, that the true author was not he who has hitherto borne the dignity. If indeed we at last determine on transferring our homage, we shall require to consider closely all who may lay claim to be the true prince; since he himself has not thought fit to lay aside his disguise before the curtain has fallen and the audience dispersed.

H. A. HEARN.

THE PARTS OF SPEECH.

THE classification of parts of speech given in Grammars has long seemed to me to be faulty in many respects. It is the object of this essay to point out some of these and to attempt a better classification.

In the first place, the basis of classification, the *fundamentum divisionis*, is seldom stated, or if it is, it is departed from frequently and irregularly. Of possible bases may be mentioned—the form of a word, the root from which it is formed, and the function which it can perform in a sentence. That the last of these will furnish the most instructive system of classification seems to be generally admitted; thus Crombie alludes to "the propensity to judge of the character of words more from their form, which is a most fallacious criterion, than from their import or signification"; and in Pearson and Strong's Student's Grammar we are told that "different words do not rank as different parts of speech in virtue of their form but of the function which they perform." Yet these authorities call "man's" a noun, and "human" an adjective, although the words perform exactly the same function. Again we are told that "here" is an adverb and "present" an adjective; but surely the sentences "I am here," "I am present," have precisely the same meaning.

There seems to be no settled rule as to whether in parsing, each word is to be treated separately, or if two or more words are ever to be taken together, and if the latter is the case, when such a course is to be adopted. The former course seems certainly the most instructive method, although there are a few cases in which it cannot be adopted, some of which will be pointed out.

I shall now proceed to give a sketch of a classification of parts of speech based on the *fundamentum* above stated, pointing out as I go on the points in which it differs from the ordinary one. It is first necessary to briefly review the analysis of the sentence. Restricting myself, for brevity's sake, to the form of sentence which logicians term a Categorical Proposition and which may be defined as a collection of words expressing a Belief,—as in the mental state which we call a Belief there may be distinguished two elements, the object of thought about which something is believed and the fact which is believed about that object of thought, so in a sentence we have the corresponding elements, the Subject, and the Grammatical

Predicate, each of which may be either one word or a combination of words. Logic further divides the Grammatical Predicate into the Copula and the Logical Predicate.

There are some words which can be used alone to form the subject of a sentence; all such words I call Nouns.*

Of Nouns there are two classes, the nouns of the grammar and what I propose to call Pronominal Nouns, including in the latter division those pronouns which fulfil the definition of Nouns just given. Wherein do these differ from ordinary nouns? The point of difference is that their meaning depends on such circumstances as who the speaker is, whom he is speaking to, or about whom he has just been speaking; while the meaning of the ordinary nouns is independent of such circumstances. Amongst Nouns Proper I include the gerund (walking, talking, &c.) and the infinitive (to walk, to talk, &c.) Let us compare the definition given above with those given in a few of the grammars.

Crombie tells us that a noun is that part of speech which expresses the subject of discourse or which is the name of the thing spoken of. The first definition is nearly the same as my own, the second is unsatisfactory unless we are told what "a name" is; and, indeed, "name" means very much the same as "noun." However, accepting the definition as satisfactory, Crombie certainly does not abide by it. He calls "John's" and other genitive cases nouns, although they never express the subject of discourse, while he relegates "I," "Thou," &c., which do express the subject of discourse, and which I think may be said to be names of the things spoken of, to the class of pronouns.

With regard to pronouns, he says that they supply the place of nouns. The meaning of this phrase "supply the place of" is not very clear. Surely it is more natural for a man addressing William Jones to say "You are wrong," than to say "William Jones is wrong," and if on different occasions he makes use of the two phrases it would be quite as correct to speak of "William Jones" as supplying the place of "You," as to speak of "You" as supplying the place of "William Jones."

Morell states that "a noun is the name of anything," which might be well enough if we had been told what a "name" is and what "anything" means, but as no such explanation is given the statement seems to define the clearer by the more obscure. Pearson and Strong go further, and seem to me to fare worse; they lay down that "a noun or name is that by which we denote anything *which exists or which we think of as existing*." Hippogriff is certainly a noun, and certainly is not the name of anything which exists, nor can it be said to be the name of anything thought of as existing, unless existence is understood in a very metaphysical sense; and how does the definition apply to such nouns as Nonentity? Subsequently they give the definition I have adopted above, but they violate it, as Crombie does, by including possessive cases and excluding pronouns.

---

* I have endeavoured to avoid the ambiguity which would arise from sometimes using the words noun, etc., in the sense in which I define them, and sometimes in that in which they are ordinarily used, by writing them with a capital when the former is the case.

The next class of words to be considered is that of adjectives. The chief use of adjectives has been explained in a most lucid manner by James Mill (Analysis of the Human Mind, vol. i. p. 144). He shows that when we have a general name to denote a certain class of objects and wish to form a term to denote a sub-class, consisting of those members of the class which possess a property not connoted by the class-name, a most economical and most useful way of doing so is by prefixing to the class-name an adjective, to denote the possession of the common property which distinguishes the sub-class. Thus from the general name horse we frame such names of sub-classes as black horse, grey horse, large horse, good horse, &c. Another important use of adjectives is to serve as logical predicates. This function may also be performed by nouns; thus I may say "John is reigning," or "John is king;" and it may be objected that since the words "reigning" and "king" in these sentences fulfil the same function, it is inconsistent with the basis of classification I have adopted to call them different parts of speech; but I think there is a slight difference in the meaning of the two sentences, and although it is not great, I consider it sufficient to justify me in conforming to ordinary usage by calling "king" a Noun, and "reigning" an adjective (*v.* Crombie's Etymology and Syntax, p. 71 *note*). There are some words which are prefixed to nouns, not to mark the possession of a certain quality but to mark whether an assertion is made of a whole class or of a part of it,—in logical language, not to affect the connotation of a term but to define its denotation. Such words are "all," "few," "some," "this," &c., which are sometimes classed as adjectives and sometimes as pronouns. I propose to call them Denotation Adjectives, giving the name Connotation Adjectives to those adjectives which fulfil Mill's description. The former differ from the latter in not being used as predicates; also a few words which are used like Connotation Adjectives to form predicates differ from them in not being capable of being prefixed to a Noun to extend its connotation or determine its denotation. Such words are "here," "there," "below," "up," "mine." These words I would class with Adjectives, putting them in a sub-class of what might be termed Predicate Adjectives. For as was said above, if we compare the two sentences, "he is here," "he is present," the functions which the words "here" and "present" perform are so similar that it seems inconsistent with the basis of classification adopted, to call them different parts of speech. No doubt "here" is generally used as an adverb and "up" as a preposition, but there are many words (*e. g.*, love, good, riding) which are sometimes one part of speech and sometimes another.

Crombie restricts the class of adjectives to those which I call Connotation Adjectives, and seems inclined to class possessives amongst them. Denotation Adjectives he ranks with articles. Morell's definition of an adjective—"A word added to a noun in order to distinguish or mark it more accurately"—would include possessives, although he does not term them adjectives, and would exclude what I have called Predicate-Adjectives. Pearson and Strong say that "adjectives or note-words help us to distinguish one individual of a class from another"; for "individual" we should, I think, read "portion" (but even then it is not the adjective which helps us to distinguish, &c., but the quality, the possession of which the adjective connotes.) If this alteration be made, their definition comes to much the same as Morell's.

Of verbs it is a sufficiently accurate definition to say that they can be used by themselves as grammatical predicates; this would exclude participles and infinitives which can be called verbs in virtue of their etymology only, not on account of their use in a sentence. The most difficult question in the parsing of verbs is whether one or more auxiliaries and an infinitive or participle (*e.g.*, shall go, will have gone) are to be treated separately or together. The general tendency seems to be to deal with the combination as a whole in those cases where the Latin equivalent is a single word. Pearson and Strong seem inclined to treat every auxiliary as a sign of a different mood or tense; I think that this course leads to a troublesome and useless multiplication of moods and tenses, and that the treatment of each word separately is both more philosophical and more instructive. Before discussing the different sorts of verbs it is necessary to speak of my next class of words, which I term Adverbials.

As from a general term we form another of more specific connotation by prefixing an adjective, so the general attribute which a verb predicates of a subject can be made more specific by the addition of other words. Thus if I say "Mary loves," I assert a comparatively general fact concerning the state of Mary's mind; if I say "Mary loves John," or "Mary loves deeply," the assertion becomes one of a more specific character. All words which can be used to make the meaning of a verb more specific and definite I propose to call Adverbials.

Of Adverbials there are several classes. One, an example of which has just been given, is that of what are commonly called accusative cases of nouns and pronouns. In English the accusative case does not differ in form from the nominative, but this is, if the expression may be used, a mere matter of accident, and the accusative and nominative cases may be as fairly treated as two different parts of speech, as "love" the verb and "love" the noun may. Some verbs are never used without an adverbial of this class; this peculiarity belongs to most of those verbs which are usually called transitive. No one would ever make such a statement as "John kills, or "The man broke;" but although such sentences are, as a matter of fact, never used, they cannot be called meaningless, and they might, if occasion required, be employed to express a general fact about "John" or "the man," of which "killing a dog," "killing a pig," or "breaking a window," and "breaking a stick" are particular instances.

If a dative case be admitted in English, words having a dative form might constitute another class of Adverbials, but the only words which have a dative form are the personal pronouns, and as this form is now identical with that of the accusative, it is scarcely necessary to consider datives as a separate class. The next important division of Adverbials is that of gerunds, or as they are sometimes but erroneously termed, participles. In English the gerund is identical with the participle in form, but as in the case of accusative-nominatives it is nevertheless necessary to distinguish them in parsing. To call "drinking" in the sentence "I am drinking" the same part of speech as drinking in "Drinking is a bad habit," is surely most unphilosophical.

The next class of adverbials to be discussed is that of infinitives. What is the English infinitive? Is the particle "to" an essential part of it? Strictly speaking, it is not. In such phrases as "I dare say," "I heard the thunder roll," the "to" is not employed, and in such sentences as "I wish to walk," "I ran to meet him," it may be contended that "to" has a prepositional force. Nevertheless, as the two words "to walk" may be replaced by the gerund "walking" (although a similar course cannot be adopted in the other example, nor indeed, in any case where the verb preceding the infinitive is a verb implying motion) and as the infinitive with "to" may be used as a Noun, I am on the whole inclined to think that the best plan to adopt is to treat the two words "to walk" as a single part of speech, and to say that there are two forms of infinitive in modern English, one with "to" and one without.

We have seen that there are some verbs which are never used without an Adverbial of the first class; there are also some verbs which are never used without being followed by an infinitive, and which, indeed, cannot take any other form of adverbial. Such verbs are "shall," "ought," "must," &c. Most of these take the infinitive without "to," and most of them are classed by grammarians as auxiliary verbs.

The next sort of adverbials is what are usually termed past participles when used as in the sentence "I have dined." And the last class is that of ordinary adverbs. With regard to the way in which those adverbials which are not adverbs are treated in grammars, I have before shown that according to the definitions given, an accusative cannot be called a Noun, nor an infinitive a verb. What is usually termed a present participle I would rank with adjectives.

The only remaining parts of speech are the preposition and the conjunction. The preposition seems to join two words, and to show the relation in which the things, qualities, or actions expressed by those words stand to each other, while the conjunction performs the same function in joining sentences. To the latter statement it has been objected that in such a sentence as "Romulus and Remus were twins," "and" joins words not sentences. I feel inclined to solve the difficulty by calling "and" in such a sentence as this a preposition; otherwise it is almost impossible to frame definitions which shall distinguish prepositions from conjunctions.

In concluding, I wish to state that my remarks are intended to be suggestive rather than conclusive, but I think that some of the questions raised are not unworthy of the attention of those interested in the study or teaching of grammar. F. J. PIRANI.

THE COLONIAL QUESTION.

AMONG all the public questions which can occupy the attention of Englishmen, whether in the colonies or in the mother country, there is not one which can compare in interest and importance with what we have called by the above title—the Colonial Question. Upon its settlement may depend the welfare and happiness of numbers of English-speaking men now living in every part of the world, and of the latest generations of Englishmen that will in the future inhabit so large a portion of the earth's surface. It is surely, then, a matter of some moment that the people of this country should make up their minds upon the question; or, at all events, that they should devote a small part of the attention now given to the minute and temporary details of our local politics to a subject of such weighty and paramount interest. With the view of assisting them to do so, we propose to devote a few pages of this number of the *Melbourne Review* to a consideration of the question—of its importance alike to ourselves, to our fellow countrymen scattered over the world, and to their and our remotest descendants—of the difficulties in the way of its satisfactory settlement, arising from circumstances affecting both the colonies and the mother country—and, lastly, of the means by which we think those difficulties may be overcome, and the question settled upon a basis which will be final in its main plan and outlines, and will yet admit of such modifications as may from time to time be required by the ever-changing conditions of such a great and widely spread political structure as it is intended to rear upon that basis.

Stated briefly, the question is simply this—What ought to be the relations existing between England and her colonies? In endeavouring to answer this problem, it will be found convenient to divide it into the following questions, more special and limited in their scope. 1st—Ought the political connection now existing between England and her colonies to be maintained? 2ndly—Is the present mode of maintaining that connection satisfactory now, and likely to be lasting in the future? 3rdly—If it is not, what plan can be suggested, at once moderate and practicable, that will be?

The first question is probably the one about which there will be the least difference of opinion, whether here, in the other colonies, or in Great Britain. So far as the colonies are concerned—although there may be here and there individual politicians whose conduct seems intended to achieve that object—there is no party whose open and avowed aim is to sever the connection with the mother country. In England also, notwithstanding that several members of the late Liberal Government were strongly suspected of working in favour of that policy, and that the Liberal party generally has been charged with indifference to the colonial connection, there can be no doubt that the mass of the people are strongly averse to any break-up of the Colonial Empire; and their views on this subject are no doubt better represented by the present Conservative Government than by the late Liberal Cabinet. At the same time, the recent speech of Mr. W. E. Forster on the subject, which has been considered by many as a distinct bid for the leadership of the Liberal party, seems to show that a reaction has commenced in the ranks of that party against the supposed anti-colonial views of certain members of the late Government, and also that the outspoken announcement of a large and enlightened policy on this subject is considered to be one of the most promising means of re-uniting the yet scattered fragments of the Liberal party. Notwithstanding, however, these signs of an improved public feeling in England, it can scarcely be hoped that the English people, any more than those of the colonies, are fully alive to the vast importance of the subject; or that the recent utterances both of the Press and of sundry politicians are not to be attributed more to a vague sentimental feeling, than to conclusions rationally deduced from definitely accepted premises. If this is the case, it may not be useless to state briefly the grounds for assigning such importance to the continued union of Great Britain and her colonies; especially as the same arguments will apply with equal force to any scheme that may be proposed for strengthening and perpetuating that union.

There are, of course, a variety of minor reasons to be given in support of the proposition that the Colonial Empire ought to be maintained—as for example, that if the Australian Colonies were separated from the mother country, there would be a constant risk of quarrels, if not actual war, arising among them; but as some of these reasons apply more particularly to Great Britain and Ireland, and others more particularly to the colonies, and as, moreover, some of them will be given when we come to deal with a scheme for strengthening the union between the different countries—we shall, for the present, be content to mention the one vital and primary reason, in comparison with which all others are small and insignificant. This is, that upon the maintenance of the British Empire, as a whole, depends the continued existence of the English nation as one of the independent and predominant races in the world; and as a probable consequence of this, the existence of English institutions, language, and all that makes up that distinctive civilisation which Englishmen believe it to be their mission to spread and perpetuate throughout the length and breadth of the habitable globe.

To put the matter more plainly still, we unhesitatingly assert that let the British Empire be once broken up—let these and the other colonies inhabited by the English race be separated from the mother country, and turned adrift to maintain their existence against the Great Powers of the world, and they will in all probability never be united again; the certain result being that they will lose their independence, and fall victims to their more powerful and aggressive neighbours. We are aware that this opinion will be scouted as an idle dream, as the fiction of a theoriser and visionary, as something not worthy to be weighed for an instant in the mind of a practical politician. We have heard before now the arguments that will be urged against such an opinion—as that these colonies would be quite able to defend themselves against any possible enemy—or even, if this were not the case, that no foreign power would be so wicked as to wantonly attack peaceful and harmless communities with a view to conquering their territory and overthrowing their institutions. We shall be told that this is an age of peace, in which wars of conquest are rapidly dying out, and in which the principle of nationality is an effectual barrier against any nation being either able or willing to subjugate and enslave another. Yet how weak must seem these arguments to those who have studied even superficially the past history of mankind, and the nature and conditions of human society, or who consider attentively the existing state of the world, and the probabilities of a not far distant future. The present is not an age of peace. On the contrary, it is a time of preparation, alike in Europe and Asia, for the greatest wars and conquests that have ever been enacted upon the theatre of the world since authentic history has chronicled the deeds of savage or civilized man;—of wars and conquests that will surpass, alike in magnitude and permanence of effects, those that have been achieved in times past by Greek or Roman, by Arab or Turk. They are indeed blind or short-sighted who fail to recognise that the most prominent characteristic of the present political era is the *consolidation of states and nations*—a consolidation proceeding with ever accelerating rapidity, and which is very far, indeed, from having reached the term and limit of its upward movement. It may, and doubtless will, be said that this is merely a temporary eddy in the ever changing current of human history, and in one sense this is true enough. A time, no doubt, will come when the forces which produce political aggregation will be exhausted, and a reverse movement in the direction of dissolution will set in, even as the forces which built up the Roman dominion became spent, and yielded to others whose continued action at length broke that dominion into fragments. But this is a consideration that need in no way affect us. The important fact is, that the present political dispensation is one in which the consolidating forces are in the ascendant, and what may come after it concerns us about as much as does the millennium. Whoever recognises these truths will see that the coming time is one in which small and weak states will have but a short and troubled existence. It will be an age when a few gigantic powers, having swallowed up all the smaller, will turn against one another, and fight out amongst themselves the question of world supremacy.

This is no dream, but a plain and lawful inference from the past history of mankind and the present condition of affairs among the nations of the earth. If we turn to Europe, we see strong signs that the German Empire will, before very long, have made itself master of all the western and central parts of that Continent. In Asia, Russia advancing from the north, and trampling out all vestiges of independence among the effete Central Asian States, will bye-and-bye approach the boundary of England's Eastern Empire; and it is impossible to doubt that the question of Asiatic supremacy will have, sooner or later, to be fought out between the two powers. Finally there is China, which only requires a re-organisation of its immense forces, a change which, however long it may be delayed by the obstinate conservatism of the inhabitants, must certainly be expected to take place sooner or later, to establish itself among the few great powers in whose hands will rest the coming destinies of mankind.* Here then, indeed, are the materials for future contests on a scale compared with which all recorded warfare is in truth but as the combats of "kites and crows." The question then arises, is the British Empire to be one of the few surviving powers which will share amongst themselves the habitable world, or is it to be one of those which will be trampled upon and partitioned among its stronger rivals?

---

* Should this view of the future of China appear to our readers extravagant and unlikely, we would remark that it is held by some of the leading authorities on questions relating to China, notably by Sir Rutherford Alcock, formerly the British Minister at Pekin, than whom no one is a better judge of the present condition and

We have no hesitation in saying that the chief element in determining this question will be the manner in which the Colonial problem is solved. If the colonies are allowed to drift away into separation from the centre of the empire, and thus the English people are broken up into a number of independent political bodies, then is the knell of England's downfall sounded; then will pass away for ever all chance of the English race being among the future rulers of the world; then will come the certainty that they, too, must pass under the yoke of conquest and subjugation, and, like many another nation as proud and powerful as themselves, place their neck humbly beneath the foot of a harder and stronger race—one which, realising the truth of the common saying that union is strength, has kept a tight grasp on all its subjects, and has not allowed itself to be rent asunder, and its forces scattered through a feeble and cowardly policy. On the other hand, if England and her colonies remain closely united together, there is no reason to fear that they will be unable to hold their own in a competition with any other powers in the world. The material forces of the empire will probably remain equal to, if not greater than those of any State that is likely to arise in the future; and there is nothing to prevent them being wielded with equal ability and determination. It will then be solely through a blind and misguided policy, or a cowardly timidity, if the English people forfeit their place among the foremost nations of the earth.

How fatal to the prospects of the English race would be a break-up of the British Empire, may be readily seen if we consider what has already been the result of that separation of the American Colonies which took place a hundred years ago. In spite of the oft-repeated statements of Liberal

---

future prospects of that great empire. It may be added that should China become ultimately a considerable naval power, these colonies, from their nearness to that country, would be particularly likely to be attacked, when, if nothing worse happened to them, they would at any rate be liable to have their gold ships and mercantile marine in general seized by Chinese ships of war. In connection with the views here expressed, the anticipated visit, as recently announced, of one of these latter to Australian waters, is an event of no small interest and significance.

writers and politicians, that the separation has been beneficial to both countries, it seems to us impossible that anyone can look at the matter impartially and uninfluenced by the traditional doctrines of Liberalism, without coming to the conclusion that it was the most disastrous event to the English people in both hemispheres that has ever happened—an event which may even yet turn out to be the determining influence on their future position among the nations of the world. To say nothing of the continual quarrels between the two countries, and the constant danger of war arising therefrom, it has cut off from all control over the affairs of Europe a full half of the English race, and has to that extent, at least, weakened the influence of Great Britain in continental questions. In fact, the separation of the American Colonies has probably more than anything else been the cause of the non-intervention policy which has slowly grown up, and has at length become a fixed principle with English Governments. Had England retained her American Colonies and strengthened her union with them in the manner we shall presently explain, she might easily have become the arbiter of Europe, instead of letting that great position pass into the hands of another people, who may posssibly some day put forth pretensions which will be fatal to the greatness and independence of the British Empire. As long, however, as England retains her existing colonies, there is always the chance of regaining the United States of America—which however small it appears now, may some day, and in view of certain by no means improbable contingencies, become very considerable. On the other hand, should England let go her present Colonial Empire, all chance of such a future reunion would vanish for ever.

The foregoing are considerations which affect equally every part of the Empire; but by way of enforcing them more particularly on the inhabitants of the Australian Colonies, it may be as well to point out that they are even more defenceless than any other parts of the Empire, such, for example, as the British Islands and Canada. Not merely is their population smaller, but what there is of it forms merely a narrow fringe on the coast line of an immense territory; while, what is still more important, the population, wealth, and intelligence of the colonies are almost entirely concentrated in two or three large coast towns, thus facilitating the conquest of the country to an immense extent. If Melbourne or Sydney were captured by an enemy with a very moderate military force, the colonies of which they are the capitals would be virtually conquered, as no resistance worth naming could be made by the rest of the country, against an enemy holding those cities with all the wealth and appliances contained in them. We mention these facts to show that in case of a break-up of the British Empire, the Australian Colonies would probably be the first to be taken possession of by an enemy.

If it is objected that no European power is likely to covet these colonies, we may remark that should Germany attain in Europe the position we have hinted at, and thereby become a great naval power, nothing is more likely than that she would look around her to see what parts of the world were worth taking possession of as fields for emigration. In such a case, she could scarcely fail to see that these colonies are exactly what she would require,—both in extent of territory, and consequent desirability as fields for emigration—and also in facility of capture. Should Germany then think fit to take possession of these colonies—and they would be quite unable to offer any effectual resistence, while it would be vain to look to England for help—she would probably send out here such a flood of German emigrants as might ultimately swamp the present English element, and make the German language and German institutions dominant throughout the length and breadth of Australia. Such a prospect will not appear extravagant to those who consider how the English have supplanted the Dutch in South Africa and New York, the French in Canada, Mauritius, and Louisiana, and the Spanish in Jamaica and Florida—and how small is the population of this continent compared with the numbers it is capable of holding. It should also be borne in mind that the Germans are one of the greatest colonising peoples in the world, and have only been prevented from competing with the other nations of Europe for the possession of a Colonial Empire—and have therefore been compelled to see their vast swarms of emigrants go to swell the forces of a foreign nation, instead of adding to their own strength—by their long political disunion and consequent want of naval and military power. These disadvantages are now rapidly disappearing, and one of the most prominent facts of the future which should guide and influence the Colonial policy of Great Britain, is the certainty that before very long Germany will have become one of the great naval powers of the world.

We think then that the first of the three questions into which the subject resolved itself may safely be considered as answered in the affirmative; and we therefore pass on to the second. Is the present bond of union between England and her colonies satisfactory now, and likely to be lasting? It appears to us that this question must be as certainly answered in the negative as the former was in the affirmative; and as this view of the question is likely to be very generally disputed, it will be necessary to go at some length into the reasons which seem to lead to such a conclusion. In the first place, then, it can scarcely be denied that the tie at present connecting the colonies with the mother country is of the very slenderest character. It consists of little else but the nomination of Governor by the English Secretary of State for the Colonies, since the right of veto upon Acts of the Colonial Legislatures is rapidly falling into abeyance.* With this exception the colonies are virtually independent. They possess full powers of legislation as regards their own internal affairs; and it is only in their relations with foreign states and with one another, or in case of internal dissensions arising in any one of them which might lead to revolution and civil war, that the influence of the home Government is really felt, and that it is seen that the colonies are yet parts of an empire whose governing centre is outside of their own boundaries.

Still, although a tie does exist between Great Britain and her colonial dependencies, it is one of an eminently unsatisfactory nature; inasmuch as it affords to neither party the advantages of complete union, or complete separation, while it is so slight as to give no guarantee that it may not be either violently broken by a sudden catastrophe, or gradually dissolved through the lapse of time and the slow growth of diverging interests. It has not the advantages of complete separation, since in case of England being involved in war, the colonies would be liable to suffer from hostile attacks; and also because though England is bound to defend her widely-scattered colonies, these latter contribute nothing to the defence fund of the empire. There are consequently a good many persons both in Great Britain and the colonies who, for these reasons, think that complete separation would be better than the existing relation between the countries; and if this was the only alternative there would be a good deal to be said for such a view of the question. Again, that the present system has not the advantages of complete union is easily seen, when we consider that the colonies have no means of making their views known, and their voice heard in the general councils of the empire. England may be involved in a war, as to the necessity of which the colonies will have had no means of expressing their opinions, although they may be exposed to greater dangers from it than England herself. Or take other questions of vital importance to the colonies—but of comparatively small consequences to England—such as the annexation of Fiji and New Guinea. In the case of the former, years were wasted before the islands were annexed, mainly because the Australian colonies had no means of making known, in an authoritative manner, the desire they had for the annexation. Similarly with New Guinea, which the people of Australia firmly believe ought to be taken possession of by England, although as we have already said, they are unable to give their opinion utterance. We are much mistaken, too, if Canada, had she been represented in the British Parliament, would have allowed her rights in the fisheries and in the island of San Juan to be ignored as they were by the Gladstone Government. At any rate it would not have been done until the Canadian representatives had expressed their views on the subject in the fullest possible manner. These examples show that cases may, and will arise in which the most important interests of the colonies are likely to be neglected or sacrificed though their having no representatives in the Imperial Councils.

---

* The fact that the Colonial Courts of Law are subordinate to those of the mother country, as represented by the Privy Council, scarcely affects this statement. Another and more real qualification to it is mentioned further on.

Another objection to the present relation between the colonies and the mother country is, that owing to the former having no voice in the general management of the empire, there is constantly growing and strengthening in each colony a narrow, local, and provincial feeling, which is not only very objectionable in its effect upon the character of each individual brought under its influence, but may in time lead to a complete estrangement of feeling on the part of the colonists for the mother country, and also for the other colonies that are not brought directly within the sphere of their own affairs. A similar result is produced in England, where the prevailing gross ignorance and indifference to colonial questions would be greatly lessened if representatives from the colonies sat side by side with those of Great Britain and Ireland in the Parliament of the Empire. The situation is, in fact, very similar to that which existed between England and Scotland before the parliamentary union of the two countries compelled each to take an interest in the affairs of the other. To sum up the objections to the present relation between Great Britain and her colones, we may say that it is scarcely better than complete separation, while it has several disadvantages that separation would remove—that in itself it is ill-calculated to stand any severe strain that may be put upon it, and that instead of tending to consolidate the interests and feelings of the different countries that are thus partially joined together, it gives ample scope for their growing divergence, which may be expected in course of time to result in a separation in name, as well as in reality.

We thus arrive at the third and most important division of the subject: what plan can be proposed that will remedy all these disadvantages, and secure a thorough and lasting union of the various English speaking communities that are now included in the British Empire? Three different schemes have been proposed, the first two of which we shall briefly notice before considering the third, which we believe to be the only true and satisfactory solution of this important question. The first plan is that each colony should send an agent or representative to London, the whole of whom would form a sort of Colonial Council that could advise the British Government on all questions affecting the interests of the colonies. The advantages of this plan would, we think, be infinitesimal, while the disadvantages would be very great. It is true, no doubt, that periodical meetings of all the colonial agents might to a certain extent interest them in one another's affairs, and also enable them collectively to draw the attention of the British Government to subjects in which they are concerned more strongly than they can do in their present separate and isolated position. But, on the other hand, it would do nothing towards giving the people of the colonies that real and living interest in Imperial affairs which is so much to be desired. Another disadvantage is that the Council would have no means of getting its resolutions carried into effect, unless they happened to coincide with the views of the British Government; and when they did not, and were accordingly disregarded, there would be danger of ill-feeling arising in the colonies, and of a conviction that the whole arrangement was a mere sham. Add to which the probability of squabbles and intrigues among the members of the Council itself, and we see that such a scheme, so far from binding together the colonies and the mother country, would most likely be a permanent source of dissension and ill-feeling. In fact, any plan that does not recognise the necessity of uniting the representatives of Great Britain and the colonies in one Legislative Assembly, must be considered as unsatisfactory; inasmuch as it fails in the primary and indispensable element of success—joint action in a common deliberative body.

We pass on to the next proposal, which has attracted more attention and gained more public favour than that we have just examined. It is that a new Imperial Parliament should be created, to which Great Britain and her colonies should send representatives in some sort of proportion to their populations, and which would have to deal with all questions affecting the interests of the Empire as a whole, leaving to the English and Colonial Parliaments the duty of dealing with the sundry local questions that concern their respective countries only. This scheme is unquestionably far superior to the one just mentioned, as it provides for the chief requisite in which that is wanting, namely, the representation of all parts of the empire in one legislative body; and there can be no doubt that if such an Imperial Parliament could be thoroughly established it would achieve the desired end of binding together in a firm and lasting manner the widely-scattered portions of the British dominions. Unfortunately, although the scheme is in many respects theoretically a good one, it has the disadvantage which attaches to so many other plausible and fair seeming plans—that of being thoroughly impracticable—thoroughly impossible of realisation. It offends against a cardinal maxim of practical statesmanship—that we should never try to create a new institution when we can attain the same, or nearly the same ends by modifying an old one. The fatal objection to it is that the English people will never consent to set up a parliamentary body which shall be supreme over the great, ancient, and venerable Parliament of England. It is hopeless to expect that they will. No possible advantages to the Empire, not even the risk of otherwise losing their colonies, would induce the English people to allow that great institution which has been from time immemorial so closely connected with the feelings, interests, and aspirations of their race to sink into the insignificance of a parish vestry, which it assuredly would do if an Imperial Parliament were set up over it. Such a change would be the greatest revolution that English institutions have ever undergone. It would involve a complete break in the continuity of the past and present, and would be the beginning of quite a new order of things. Moreover, even if the practical difficulties in the way of establishing it were surmounted, such an institution would have several great disadvantages to contend with. It would be a totally new body, without any of the prestige that attaches to the existing British Parliament, its relation to which would take a long time to become thoroughly settled and defined; and there would always be a danger that the old Parliament would struggle against the inferior position which was assigned to it, and that its supporters might start an agitation to get rid of the colonies, rather than submit to a change so distasteful to them. We arrive then at the conclusion that the establishment of a new Imperial Parliament is altogether impracticable, and even if practicable, is in many respects undesirable: all the more so as there is a plan which we shall now proceed to discuss, that will secure all its advantages without any of its drawbacks, and which is at the same time strictly in accordance with the past development of the English constitution.

This plan is that the colonies should send parliamentary representatives to the existing House of Commons; their number being determined by the ratio of the populations of the various colonies to that of Great Britain and Ireland. Thus, to put the matter roughly, if we suppose the population of the latter to be 33 millions, and that of all the English speaking colonies to be about seven millions—numbers which are not very far from the truth; then as the total number of members of the House of Commons is 658, the colonies would contribute about 140. Or if we place the population of the Australasian colonies at two millions, the number of their representatives would be 40, of which Victoria, numbering 800,000 souls, would contribute 16. It will thus be seen that the number of representatives sent by the colonies to the Parliament of the Empire would be by no means insignificant, and on all questions specially affecting colonial interests their voice would certainly have very great weight. At the same time there is nothing in the proposed measure that can in any way conflict with the traditions of the most conservative upholders of the English constitution. It is, in fact, strictly in accordance with the precedents of the union with Scotland and Ireland—and merely consists in the creation of a number of new constituencies—boroughs, and counties; the fact of their being scattered at wide distances over the globe being one that involves no theoretical distinction whatever. The proposed scheme, then, is one that would have all the required advantages of uniting into one legislative body the representatives of all the English communities throughout the world—and thus of converting into a really Imperial Parliament that which now wrongly usurps the name. This plan is by no means new. On the contrary, it has perhaps been more frequently proposed and discussed by political writers—from Adam Smith downwards—than either of the two plans we have already examined. As, however, the full advantages of the scheme have seldom been brought prominently forward, while the difficulties in the way of its realisation and the supposed objections to its practical working have usually led to its rejection as impracticable or premature, it is desirable that the former should be first stated plainly, and the latter examined more briefly afterwards, in order to see whether the objections are really fatal to the scheme or not.

We have already mentioned one advantage that the proposed union would undeniably effect, namely the removal of all danger of the disruption of the Empire, since however defective it might be found to be in its actual working, when once established there would be no likelihood of its ever being undone, and the old system of disunion reverted to again. Another great evil inherent in the present system would also be effectually removed—and that is the diversity of legislation which arises from the unlimited powers possessed by the colonial Parliaments. This is an evil which, though not very generally appreciated, is, nevertheless, very considerable, and is, of course, constantly increasing. Although the British Government has nominally the power of vetoing Acts passed by the colonial Legislatures, yet, as we have already seen, it has allowed this power to become obsolete. Nor would it be either practicable or desirable for it to attempt to exercise this power. When once Parliaments became established in the colonies it was merely a question of time when they were to become supreme in their respective countries, and when the Home Government was to lose all control over them. As a natural result, therefore, various legislative measures have been passed by colonial Parliaments which involve changes not yet recognised by the British Legislature. As an example, we may mention the law relating to marriage with a deceased wife's sister, changes in which have been recently effected throughout the colonies, while it remains unchanged in those parts of the Empire that are legislated for by the British Parliament. Now even though it should be admitted that this and other changes in the laws that have been made by colonial Parliaments are good in themselves, and likely sooner or later to be adopted in the mother country, this in no way affects the principle we are contending for, that it is most undesirable to have throughout the Empire a diversity of laws on subjects so deeply affecting the welfare of society as these.*

---

* An example of the inconvenience of such legislation has just been shown, by a deputation which lately waited upon Lord Carnarvon, and explained to him the disabilities under which the wives and children of such colonial marriages were placed in

But there is yet another aspect of the question which more particularly concerns the colonies: and it is this. There can be no doubt that, although on a few points colonial legislation may be in advance of the mother country, yet, on the whole, there is far more legislative activity in the British Parliament than in those of the colonies. The result is that changes are being constantly made in the laws of Great Britain and Ireland which, from the nature of the present system, do not apply to the colonies at all. And when we consider how small is the chance of any colonial—at any rate Victorian—Ministry taking the trouble to adopt the latest English legislative improvements, it is seen that the colonies must necessarily lag behind Great Britain and Ireland in this respect. In other words, the present system deprives the colonies of the benefits to be derived from the ability and experience of the distinguished lawyers and statesmen who are to be found in the British Parliament. As an extreme example of the state of things to which the Empire is now tending, we may point to the great American Republic, which consists of some forty states, each of which has its own Legislature, that, not content with dealing with purely local questions, claims and exercises an indefinite power of legislation; thus giving rise to a complexity of laws throughout the Union more easily imagined than described. It may be added that unity of legislation has always proved itself a potent source of political and social unity, while diversity has encouraged the opposite tendency.

Another and more serious evil than the differences in legislation, which have grown up under the present colonial system, is the variety of tariffs and financial policies. Anything more absurd or better calculated to destroy the unity of the Empire, than the so-called protective tariffs which are in operation in several of the colonies, and notably in Victoria, it is difficult to imagine. Even the states composing the North American Republic, with all their financial and political backwardness, have never dreamt of preventing the free interchange of commodities among themselves. They doubtless had sense enough to see that anything like political unity would be impossible if custom houses were built along the bound-

England—the object of the deputation being to induce the Secretary for the Colonies to introduce a Bill into the British Parliament to remove such disabilities. The moral we draw from this, is, however, the reverse of that drawn by the Colonial Press, and is, that instead of expecting the Home Government to provide against evils which our own legislation has created, we ought rather to let our laws remain the same as those of England, until we have representatives in the Imperial Parliament, who will give their votes and counsel towards improving the legislative system of the whole empire.

aries of the different states. Again, even long before the Germans had achieved their hard-won unity, a Zollverein or customs union was established under the guidance of Prussia, which introduced complete freedom of trade between the different states, and thereby contributed in no small measure towards paving the way for that unity of feeling and interests upon which all true and lasting political unity must be based. It is not too much to say that the colonial protective tariffs can have no semblance even of reason for their existence, save as a means of bringing about separation and colonial independence, which they have done more to promote than any other agency that can be named. Now, under the proposed system, there would of course be free trade between every part of the empire. All diversity of tariffs would vanish as surely as they have vanished between England, Scotland, and Ireland; and the results alike to the colonies and the mother country would be no less beneficial than were those which followed the unions of these countries.

Another reason why the colonies in particular should desire to be represented in the British Parliament is, that even under the present system of apparently complete colonial independence, there are cases in which the Home Parliament is compelled to legislate on matters which affect the colonies as much they do the mother country. Such questions as the laws relating to patent and copyright, merchant shipping, the extradition of criminals, and the naturalization of aliens, must of necessity be dealt with by the British Parliament; and it is therefore desirable that the colonies affected by such legislation should have a voice in deciding it.*

We have already alluded to an evil resulting from the present colonial system, which is perhaps not sufficiently realised by most people in the colonies, and that is the narrow provincial feeling which has grown up, and which is intensifying year by year. Colonists, instead of looking to the reports of the House of Commons for the speeches of their representatives, have to read the debates of their own Assemblies, and consequently the larger affairs of the empire are virtually ignored by the great majority of them. It is as if a citizen of London or Liverpool were to confine his attention to the doings of the Town Council, and neglect altogether the transactions of the British Parliament. If, however, the colonies sent representatives to an Imperial Assembly, they would be compelled to study the proceedings of that Assembly, and their mental horizon would be greatly enlarged. They would then, indeed, feel themselves citizens of an empire on which the sun never sets, which at present they can hardly be said to do at all. Again, what a wide field would be opened up to the ambition of the colonial politician! He would sit side by side, and on terms of perfect equality, with the representatives of the historic counties and boroughs of Great Britain and Ireland. His voice would be heard along with theirs. He would have a vote in deciding the fate of Imperial Ministries; and might himself have a seat in the Cabinet, with the chance, then open to every citizen of the empire, of becoming Prime Minister and shaping the destinies of the nation.

---

* On this question of Imperial legislation, there has recently been a lively discussion in the columns of the English press; one party contending for the right and utility of Imperial legislation on these subjects, and the other party contending for complete colonial immunity from such control. Whatever may be the legal aspect of the question, it is difficult to see how anyone can object to such Imperial legislation, except on two grounds, namely, either that the colonies are not represented in the Imperial Parliament, or that they ought to become totally independent states—ought to cease to be portions of the British Empire.

Another benefit that the colonies more particularly would derive from the union we are proposing is, that as every part of the empire would then contribute a share to the fund for its general defence and extension, the Imperial Government would be far more likely to undertake such further annexations of territory as are required in the interests of the colonies. It will, for example, scarcely be disputed that it is most undesirable for Australia that any great foreign power should secure a footing in the islands of the South Pacific Ocean. And the only means by which this can be effectually prevented is for the British Government to take possession of them as soon as possible. As long as they remain unoccupied, we cannot well object to a foreign power seizing upon such of them as it may choose. But the recently-published correspondence of Lord Carnarvon with the Governor of New South Wales shows that as long as the Australian colonies refuse to contribute anything to the expense of governing these islands, the British Government will abstain from annexing them until absolutely compelled to do so. Now it is surely a very short-sighted policy for us to refuse giving the small amount of pecuniary assistance that would induce the Home Government to take possession of New Guinea, and of such islands in the South Pacific as may be considered most valuable. Their occupation by England is a question that really concerns us far more than it does the mother country; and it should be borne in mind that were these colonies to become independent they would be compelled to take some steps to prevent the islands from falling into the hands of a foreign power. In such a case the expense would fall entirely upon them, and would, therefore, be far larger than any amount they would otherwise have to contribute. The same argument can be used against those who may object that it would be foolish on the part of the colonies to agree to any plan that would involve their contributing to the defence of the empire, when under the present system the entire cost of such defence is incurred by the Home Government. As we have already stated, not merely is the present system unfair to the people of Great Britain and Ireland, and leads many of them to regard the colonies as a burden and encumbrance to them rather than as a source of strength; but it should be clearly kept in mind that the independence of these colonies would necessitate their keeping up a naval and military establishment and diplomatic service which would be far more costly to them, and far less efficient than are the imperial establishments to which they are now asked to contribute their fair share, in common with all the other portions of the Empire. To put the question shortly, we may say that it involves a choice between the centralization and consequent efficient and economical management of the naval, military, and diplomatic service of the Empire, and their dispersion, with all the waste and loss of efficiency necessarily attendant upon such a process.

We have now reached a stage in our argument when it may be convenient to recapitulate the various reasons that have been given in support of the proposal for the representation of the colonies in the British House of Commons. It would secure the stability and permanence of the Empire; and although it would involve a contribution by the colonies to the fund for its defence and maintenance, yet such a contribution would be far less than would be the cost to them, if they were independent, of their own protection and representation at foreign courts. It would be the means of inducing the Imperial Government to annex all such territories in the Pacific Ocean and Indian Archipelago as might be either intrinsically valuable to the colonies or dangerous to them if in the hands of a foreign power. It would secure a uniform legislative system for the whole British Empire, and thereby enable the colonies to participate in the legislative ability that is to be found in the English Parliament. It would bring about a uniform tariff and complete freedom of trade throughout the Empire, in place of the numerous and varying tariffs and protective systems that at present exist. It would check that rapidly growing provincialism of opinion and feeling which is such a marked result of our local parliamentary system, and would give the inhabitants of all the colonies a real and active interest in the affairs of the whole Empire. It would also compel the people of Great Britain and Ireland to take a much greater interest in, and keep themselves better informed on colonial affairs, than is now the case. At the same time if any colony had a grievance, either against some other colony or against the mother country, it would be able through its representatives in the Imperial Parliament to make that grievance known and have it redressed; instead of as now having to depend on the precarious assistance of some member of the House of Commons, or some special influence with the Colonial Office. Finally, it would afford a much wider field for the energy and ambition of colonial politicians than the present limited areas within which they are compelled to confine their efforts.

We think, then, it will be admitted that a strong case has been made out for the proposal that the colonies should be represented in the British House of Commons; and it only remains to examine briefly what objections to it have been, or are likely to be, brought forward by its opponents. And to begin with, we wish it to be clearly understood that the scheme here advocated is not intended in any way to supplant the system of local parliamentary government, now so firmly established in nearly all the British colonies. Its object is rather to supplement that system on points where its action is incomplete, or altogether wanting. The colonial Parliaments would remain as they are, only with their sphere of action somewhat diminished. They would have to surrender part of their powers of general legislation, but this would enable them to perform all the better their real duties of seeing to the requirements of their respective countries.

It is not unlikely that this project will be opposed by those colonial politicians who look forward to the confederation of the Australian colonies as the goal of their ambition; and the end for which all should strive who desire the welfare of this country. But although such a confederation is in many respects desirable, it will probably be found more difficult to accomplish than the plan here proposed, owing to the jarring interests and mutual jealousies of the different colonies. Nothing but the fact of having a powerful and semi-hostile state on their border induced the North-American colonies to lay aside their feelings of antagonism and coalesce into a great confederation. But there is no such cause here to compel these colonies to abandon their petty jealousies, and unite for the purpose of strengthening their position. We think, therefore, that British and colonial statesmen should direct their efforts towards the achievement of the scheme here advocated, instead of wasting them on one of which the ultimate success is doubtful, and which even if certain, is of comparatively small advantage; since the confederation of the Australian colonies, so far from tending to unite all parts of the Empire, would be more likely to lead the colonists to believe that they were strong enough to stand alone, and maintain their independence against all possible enemies.

An objection that has been raised against the practicability of the proposed plan is that the distances which separate England and her colonies are so great as to make it impossible for colonial representatives to pass to and fro between their constituencies and the Imperial Parliament. We think, however, that this objection becomes very small when looked into more closely. The distances alluded to are now—owing to the great improvements made of late years in the means of transit—practically scarcely greater than those which a century ago separated the farthest parts of the British Islands. The journey from England to Australia can now be done in a little over forty days, and there is no reason to suppose that the final limit of speed has yet been reached. Besides, the electric telegraph will enable colonial members to be in constant communication with their constituents, so that the obstacles caused by the distances which separate even the farthest parts of the empire from its political centre are really by no means so great as they have been represented. Other objections of a similar nature have been raised, such as the difficulty of getting suitable members; but these are all points of detail which we believe would speedily settle themselves, when once the scheme was inaugurated; and it should be borne in mind that the question to be really considered is not whether the plan is perfect, and free from all difficulties, but whether the objections to it are so great as to outweigh the advantages which have been brought forward in its favour. We hardly think that any unprejudiced mind will assert that they are. In fact the root of the objections lies in the apparent novelty of the plan — in the almost unconquerable aversion that the mass of mankind have for any great change, however necessary it may be; in that blind and obstinate conservatism upon which many a nation has been shipwrecked in times past, and doubtless will be in times to come. For if there is one lesson more deeply engraved upon the mind of the student of history than another, it is—that the nations which refuse to remodel their institutions from time to time, in accordance with the changes that are taking place around them, are swept out of the way; while the empire of the world belongs to those who recognise the necessity for change, and accept it. "In the mighty vortex of the world's history, which inexorably crushes all peoples that are not as hard and flexible as steel," to quote an expression of one of the greatest living historians, the English nation has hitherto held its own, and the question which Englishmen now have to decide is whether, by a timely reorganisation of the forces of the empire, they will place themselves in a position to hold their own in the time that is coming. We have endeavoured in this paper to indicate what seems to us a necessary basis for such reorganisation; and it may be remarked that now, when there is a temporary lull in the affairs of the world, is the best time that can be chosen to make the required changes. Those who, while professing to agree with the plan here proposed, talk about its being premature, and say that we are not ripe for such a change, and that a generation hence will be early enough to begin carrying such a scheme into effect—little dream of the changes that will be witnessed by the coming generation. It is extremely questionable if, under the present colonial system, the unity of the empire will survive the storms of the next twenty or thirty years; and if it does English statesmen will have other and more urgent business on their hands than that of arranging their relations with the colonies. A period of quiet, like the present, is the time above all others that a real statesman would choose for effecting any great change in the constitution of his country. Those then who proclaim that we are not yet ripe for the practical realization of a scheme that they admit is desirable in itself, must either be credited with want of foresight as to the near future, or with want of knowledge as to the conditions necessary for carrying out successfully a great political reform. In conclusion, it may be remarked that these colonies ought more particularly to take the initiative in such a proposal as this, since it is of more importance to them than it is to England. We are far less able to stand alone than she is. At the same time we believe no objections to the plan would be raised in the mother country, if the colonies were unanimously to demand it. Should they not do so, but shutting their eyes to the inexorable march of events, remain content to drift along in their present courses, they must expect some day to be rudely awakened; and however much they may then desire to make the long-neglected reform, they will find inscribed upon the door through which they must pass in order to reach it those ill-omened words, so often ere now written in letters of blood before the eyes of expiring states and nations: *Too Late.*

CRITICAL NOTICE.

"Kamilaroi and Other Australian Languages," by the Rev. William Ridley, M.A. Second Edition, revised and enlarged, with comparative tables of words from twenty Australian languages and songs. Traditions, Laws, and Customs of the Australian race. Sydney: Government Printing Office.

Poor in physique, repulsive in appearance, and with mental faculties scarcely surpassing brute instinct, the aborigines of Victoria, never numerous, are rapidly taking their place amongst the traditions of the old colonists. The "noble savage" theory has not seemed to fit them—the poetry that invests the "red browed ruler of the shade" with fictitious virtues and dignities has not been successful in awakening any local enthusiasm in their behalf, though the excellent little poems of Mr. George Gordon McCrae, "Māmba" and "Balladeādro", were a praiseworthy effort in that direction.

Nevertheless, unpromising as the subject may be as a vehicle for poetry or fiction, it would be a matter of lasting regret to all who have the slightest interest in ethnological science, if a whole race of our fellow-creatures should be allowed to pass away before us without some attempt towards securing a permanent and reliable record of their religion and language, manners and customs. The Bureau of Indian affairs at Washington has been engaged for very many years, with the assistance of some of the leading ethnologists of the world, in the compilation of a comprehensive account of the aborigines of North America, and five ponderous volumes have been already published as an earnest of the thoroughly exhaustive manner in which it is contemplated to deal with a question that is daily fading from investigation. Some publicity was recently given to the fact that Mr. R. Brough Smyth has been for many years engaged on a careful compilation in the direction of a history of the aboriginal tribes, but the prospect of its early completion does not appear to be assured.

The book named at the head of this page, a second edition of which has recently been issued from the Government printing office in Sydney, shows that our fellow colonists beyond the Murray are not so engrossed in material pursuits as to be oblivious to their duties in the domains of history and literature.

Though not absolutely so stated in the Rev. Mr. Ridley's book, it may be assumed from the imprimatur, and the elegant and costly style of its production, that it is published at the expense of the New South Wales Government; and they are to be congratulated on having been so fortunate as to secure the services of a writer who, in this laudable attempt towards a permanent scientific record of the fast perishing tribes, has shown himself an enthusiastic philologist, and a careful student of human nature in the crude state.

The two languages which receive the fullest consideration and grammatical illustration are named *Kamilaroi,* which is that of the aborigines of the Namoi Barwan, Bundurra, and Balonne rivers, and of the Liverpool Plains and the Upper Hunter, and *Turrubul,* the language of the aborigines of the Brisbane river. Necessarily imperfect as must always be the language of a people without the art of writing, there are evidences (to use the author's own words) in "the inflections of verbs and nouns, the derivation and composition of words, the arrangement of sentences, and the methods of imparting emphasis, which indicate an accuracy of thought and a force of expression surpassing all that is commonly supposed to be attainable by a savage race."

Besides the very careful examination of the two languages named above, there are phrases and vocabularies in eight or nine others, and a comparative table of a large number of leading words in twenty different dialects. Half a dozen pages are devoted to an interesting record of their principal traditions, and as many more to a collection of their current stories and songs, the latter showing some merit occasionally in their happy turn for satire. The habits and manners of the various tribes are briefly reviewed in conclusion, and a large amount of information is given respecting their tribal institutions and laws, wherein much that belongs to the Mosaic code, and much that is common to the Masonic craft are weirdly intermingled.

If the time ever comes when the united colonies shall admit the desirability of having one comprehensive history of the aborigines of Australia upon a scientific basis, it is certain that though the fervid missionary spirit of our author may render him less reliable upon the ethical questions involved, his work will be of immense service to those who may be entrusted with the final casting of the materials into their permanent form. Indeed, if a literary monument is erected to commemorate the race whom we have virtually extirpated, the Revd. Mr. Ridley will undoubtedly have contributed the chief corner stone. It is only due to the prestige of Sydney to say that as a specimen of typographic art, the book is equal to the very best efforts of the London press.

H. G. T.

"DRESS, WITH REFERENCE TO HEAT," by Walter Balls-Headley, M.D. Melbourne: J. & A. M'Kinley.

A LECTURE lately delivered by Dr. Walter Balls-Headley on "Dress, with Reference to Heat," before the Australian Health Society, has just been published in pamphlet form. We can do little more than call the attention of our readers to this eminently utilitarian publication, with the assurance that they will profit by the perusal of it. Popular in style, and singularly free from medical phraseology and scientific terms, it contains the fullest information upon the subject of dress, and one acquires knowledge in reading it without being too conscious of the effort. Perhaps special attention might be called to the remarks on tight-lacing, although judging from the popularity of that practice it seems useless to point out its evils. The doctor is occasionally jocular, as for instance where he recommends women to wear their hair of a dull yellow or light shade in winter, and a dark brown or black in summer. Considering the ponderous solemnity of most advice-giving publications, this occasional jocularity is refreshing. We have not space to notice Dr. Balls-Headley's lecture at any length, but cannot help congratulating him and the Australian Health Society upon its appearance in pamphlet form. The Society will be doing a public service if it can ensure the publication of a series of such lectures.

No. I. *(Published Quarterly).* Price, 2s. 6d.

THE MELBOURNE REVIEW.

JANUARY 1876.

CONTENTS:

			PAGE
	Address to our Readers		1
I.	On the Relation of the State to Religious and Ecclesiastical Bodies in Victoria	Rev. Robt. Potter, B.A.	3
II.	History and Geography	Edward E. Morris, M.A.	21
III.	The Story of the Eureka Stockade, Part 1.	Marcus Clarke	32
IV.	The Political Future of Europe		38
V.	The Drama as a Fine Art	Arthur P. Martin	57
VI.	Labour and Capital	H. K. Rusden	67
VII.	An Episode in Californian Banking	H. G. Turner	84
VIII.	The Basis of National Prosperity	Rev. T. F. Bird	93
IX.	Brain Waves	H. M. Andrew, M.A.	105
X.	Public Affairs in Victoria		111
XI.	Critical Notices		120

MELBOURNE:

SAMUEL MULLEN, 55 & 57 COLLINS STREET EAST.

[*The right of translation and reproduction reserved.*]

KRUSE'S INSECTICIDE.

This Powder is unrivalled in destroying FLEAS, BUGS, ANTS, FLIES, COCKROACHES, BEETLES, GNATS, MOSQUITOS, MOTHS IN FURS, and every other species of insects in all stages of metamorphosis, whilst it has no qualities deleterious to human beings, and is quite harmless in its application to Dogs, Cats, Poultry, Pigeons, &c. In 1s. packets., and in tins, 1s. 6d., 5s., and 10s.

Sold by all Chemists and Druggists

KRUSE'S FLUID MAGNESIA.

KRUSE'S FLUID MAGNESIA for upwards of Ten Years has been approved and prescribed by the leading members of the Medical Profession. Its almost universal use affords sufficient proof of the high estimation in which it is held by the public generally. It is carefully prepared of uniform strength, each fluid ounce contains Ten Grains of pure Carbonate of Magnesia.

Kruse's Fluid Magnesia speedily removes Heartburn, Acid Eructations, Sourness, or Irregular Digestion of Females and Children.

It composes the Stomach in a few minutes after any excess or hard drinking.

The Solution is of itself an agreeable aperient, but its laxative properties can be much augmented by taking with it a little of Kruse's Syrup of Raspberries and Lemon ; in this manner a very agreeable effervescent draught can be safely taken at any time during fever or thirst.

The antiseptic qualities of this Solution, owing to the presence of so much carbonic acid have been found very valuable in Putrid, Scarlet, and other Fevers. As a lotion for the mouth it sweetens the breath, and the Magnesia cleans the teeth from Tartar.

I have used the Fluid Magnesia prepared by Mr. John Kruse with the most satisfactory results. I consider it a valuable antacid and aperient in Dyspepsia and irregularity of the bowels, and an excellent medicine for children.

With the Raspberry and Lemon Syrup it forms a grateful drink, and will relieve the flatulence and allay the vomiting which is so distressing in the early months of pregnancy.

(Signed) JAMES GEORGE BEANEY, F.R.C.S.
Surgeon to the Melbourne Hospital, &c.

Sold in Half-Pints, 1s. 6d. ; Pints, 2s. 6d. ; Quarts, 3s. 6d. per Bottle, by all Chemists and Druggists throughout the Colonies.

Wholesale: FELTON, GRIMWADE & CO., Melbourne.

DANCING. CALISTHENICS.

MESSIEURS & MISS ROBERTS,

Professors of Dancing, Calisthenics,

"*Maintien et de bonne tenue.*"

87 COLLINS ST. EAST, MELBOURNE, & ASSEMBLY HALL, ST. KILDA.

Receive pupils and give private instruction in the above useful and elegant accomplishments, at their "*Salle où l'on montre à danser.*" Messieurs and Miss Roberts impart to their pupils the modern and Fashionable Style of Dancing, as taught by the most distinguished professors in London and Paris, and approved of and adopted by Royalty and the *elite* at the Court Balls, *les reunions dansantes* in Europe. Educational Establishments and private families attended. Terms and prospectuses on application.

JUST PUBLISHED.

Roberts's Manual of Fashionable Dancing and Vade Mecum for the Ballroom,

Containing a Review and full description of all the Modern Dances, illustrated.
Sold by the authors, 87 Collins-st. east: G. Robertson, publisher ; and all book and music sellers. 2s. 6d.

THE

MELBOURNE ATHENÆUM.

LIBRARY AND READING ROOMS,

COLLINS STREET EAST,

IMMEDIATELY ABOVE THE TOWN HALL AND OPPOSITE THE "ARGUS" OFFICE.

IN the principal Reading Room will be found Newspapers from all parts of Victoria and the neighbouring Colonies; the leading London and Provincial papers are laid on the tables immediately on the arrival of the English Mail Steamer.

The supply of Magazines and Periodicals, scientific, artistic, literary and amusing, is most complete, and includes every publication of note, either Home or Colonial. Of the more popular, two or more copies are supplied. These may be borrowed by members.

There is a separate Reading Room for Ladies, supplied with suitable newspapers and periodicals. Subscription per annum, Ten Shillings.

The Library is divided into two Departments—the Circulating Library and a Library of Reference. The former contains between 15,000 and 16,000 volumes which are lent to members and their families. New works are being constantly added. To many the Library of Reference will be found of value, as it contains such works as Parliamentary Proceedings, Gazettes, Encyclopædias, Men of the Time, Directories, the best Etymological and Scientific Dictionaries, &c. &c.

A room is provided for conversation, smoking, chess, &c.

Classes are held during the week, at convenient times, for instruction in French, Italian, Chemistry, Singing, Dancing, Elocution, Phonography, the subjects for the Civil Service and Matriculation Examinations, &c., to which members are admitted at a reduced scale of fees.

Lectures, on various subjects, are delivered in the course of the year, at certain of which members are privileged to attend at reduced charges.

The Subscription to the Institution, entitling a member to the whole of these advantages, is £1 per annum, or Ten Shillings half-yearly. No Entrance Fee is charged. Members can join at any period of the year.

Any further information that may be desired will be gladly rendered on application, at the Institution, to

GARNET WALCH, *Secretary.*

SCOTCH COLLEGE.

PRINCIPAL: ALEXANDER MORRISON, M.A.

VICE-PRINCIPAL: ROBERT MORRISON, M.A.,
Senior Hope Scholar, Edinburgh University,

Assisted by Twelve Regular and Eight Visiting Masters.

THE Scotch College is situated on the Eastern Hill, the highest part of Melbourne. The buildings face the Treasury and Fitzroy Gardens, and occupy a position well-known for its salubrity and retirement, and for the beauty of its surroundings. The accommodation for the Boarding School was erected in 1873, and has been constructed on the most approved principles.

The Principal of the College is now on his way to Melbourne. During the past year he has visited several of the leading British and Continental Schools. On his return he will revise the present scheme of study and arrangements, with a view of introducing such improvements as his enlarged experience may suggest.

"In the various examinations held during the year at the University the candidates from the Scotch College were very successful. Since last report, 25 boys were sent up for matriculation, 22 of whom have passed; 36 boys were sent up for the Civil Service, 33 of whom have passed; of the 36 candidates in English, all were successful; of 26 in Latin, 25 passed; of 36 in arithmetic, 32 passed, 4 passing well; of 33 in algebra, 29 passed, 8 passing well; of 35 in Euclid, 33 passed, 9 passing well.

During the year 1875 the pass and honour list at the University included the names of 22 different students, all of whom matriculated direct from the Scotch College. In arts three passed the first year, two the second, two the third (B.A.), one the fourth (M.A.). In medicine, two passed the first year, four the second, two the third, three the fourth. In engineering, two passed the first year, one the second, one the third. In laws, two passed the fourth year (LL.B.). At the honour examinations, one gained a scholarship, one an exhibition, two took first-class honours, four second-class honours, one third-class honours. In interscholastic matches the representatives of the College maintained its position as first at cricket and boating, and second at football.

Work will be resumed, after the Christmas holidays, on Wednesday, 26th January.

The Principal, Vice-Principal, and other masters will attend at the College on Tuesday, 25th January, to enrol and classify new pupils.

Copies of the Prospectus may be obtained at the College, and from Mr. Mullen, Collins-street.

W. B. WOOD, CHEMIST,

8 BOURKE STREET EAST, Sole Maker and Proprietor of Dr. BLAIR'S New Compound,

COD LIVER OIL AND IODIDE OF IRON.

OPPOSITE GENERAL POST OFFICE

SPECIAL ANALYSIS.

"Government Analytical Laboratory, Melbourne, April 30th, 1874.

"I have examined a sample of Dr. Blair's new compound of Cod Liver Oil and Iodide of Iron. It is a simple emulsion of the oil, without any alkaline substance whatever. It is doubtless an elegant method of administering two nauseous medicines, and is in a pharmaceutical sense a perfectly reliable compound.

"WM. JOHNSON, Government Analytical Chemist."

Sold in Bottles, 2s., 3s. 6d., and 6s. each.

Also Proprietor of

WOOD'S SKIN OINTMENT,

For all Diseases of the Skin and Affections of the Scalp, Ulcerated Legs, Old Sores, Irritation of the Skin, &c., &c. Testimonials unquestionably prove this Ointment to be most efficacious of any as yet offered to the Public. Sold in Pots, 1s. 6d., 2s. 6d., and 5s. Perfumed for the Scalp, 2s. 6d.

The Melbourne Review,

A Quarterly Publication devoted to Philosophy, Theology, Science, Art, Politics, and Belles-Lettres.

THE SECOND NUMBER WILL BE PUBLISHED ON THE

1st of APRIL,

And will contain Contributions unavoidably held over from the First Issue.

Among the Writers for that and subsequent numbers of the *Review* will be the following:—Miss Turner, Miss E. J. Spence (of Adelaide), Professor Pearson, Professor Strong, Rev. A. Gosman, James Smith, F. J. Pirani, M.A., G. S. Elkington, M.A., Garnet Walch, Geo. Gordon M'Crea, Dr. William Thomson, Dr. P. Moloney, and several others.

Subscriptions and Advertisements will be received by

SAMUEL MULLEN, 55 & 57 COLLINS STREET EAST.

Subscription, 10s. per Annum; by Post in Victoria, 11s. 6d.

J. AND A. M'KINLEY,
COMMERCIAL AND GENERAL PRINTERS,
QUEEN STREET, MELBOURNE.

FRANCIS AND SWIFT,

DISPENSING CHEMISTS,

31 BOURKE STREET EAST

(One Door East of Messrs. Buckley and Nunn's),

IMPORTERS OF

India Rubber Mattresses (Air and Water), Pillows. Cushions.

BOTTLES FOR HOT WATER APPLICATIONS, &c.

Waterproof Sheeting. Elastic Stockings, Kneecaps, and Anklets. Trusses. Enemas. Respirators. Magneto-Electric and Galvanic Machines, Medicine Chests. Cotton Rollers and Elastic Bandages. Inhalers. Spray Producers, for use in Diptheria, &c.

PULVERMACHER'S CHAINS AND BELTS,

And Surgical and Medical Appliances generally, for the Sick Room or Invalid.

List of Some of the New Books of the Season

IN CIRCULATION AT

MULLEN'S LIBRARY.

The Abode of Snow, by Andrew Wilson; G. H. Lewes on Actors and Acting; Ingelow's Fated to be Free; Myers' Remains of Lost Empires; Tennyson's Queen Mary; Trollope's The Way We Live Now; Mrs. Oliphant's Whiteladies; R. F. Burton's Ultima Thule, Travels in Iceland; Miss Angel, by Miss Thackeray; Reminiscences of W. C. Macready; Autobiography of Mrs. Fletcher; Akimfoo, by Major Butler; Sermons Out of Church, by the Author of John Halifax; Drummond's Large Game of S. E. Africa; Leah! a Woman of Fashion; The Unseen Universe; Gladstone's Rome, and the Newest Fashions in Religion; Smith's Assyrian Discoveries; Braddon's Hostages to Fortune; Last Leaves from the Journals of J. C. Young; Mrs. Burton's Inner Life of Syria; Buckland's Log Book of a Fisherman; Symonds' The Renaissance in Italy; Castelar's Life of Lord Byron; Fighting the Air, by Florence Marryat; Dilke's Papers of a Critic; Dowden's Shakespeare—His Mind and Art; Livingstone's Last Journals; The Boudoir Cabal; Greville's Journals; The Fifth Volume of Kinglake's Invasion of the Crimea; Macgahan's Campaigning on the Oxus; Sir Samuel Baker's Travels in Central Africa: Thomson's the Straits of Malacca, &c.; "Comin' Through the Rye;" Black's Three Feathers; Autobiography of Dr. Guthrie; The Sandwich Islands, by Isabella Bird; Rawlinson's England and Russia in the East; Alice Lorraine.

This Library was designed to promote the circulation of the Best Literature of the Day, and is conducted on the system which now prevails at Mudie's and other eminent Libraries in Great Britain. Selections of the Newest Books are made immediately on their appearance in London, and are despatched to Melbourne by each Mail Steamer. No Books of real merit are omitted from these selections, while preference is given to Works of History, Biography, Voyages, Travels, and the higher class of Fiction.

Annual Subscriptions, from One Guinea. Country Subscriptions, from Three Guineas and upwards, according to the number of Books required. Names of New Subscribers entered Daily.

SAMUEL MULLEN, 55 & 57 COLLINS STREET EAST.

THE PRINCIPAL FURNITURE AND CARPET WAREHOUSE.

W. H. ROCKE & CO.,

40 & 42 COLLINS STREET EAST, MELBOURNE.

THE CHEAPEST HOUSE IN THE TRADE.

DRAWINGROOM SUITES,
IN SATIN,
SILK REP,
CRETONNE.

DININGROOM SUITES,
IN MOROCCO,
ROAN LEATHER,
HAIR CLOTH.

OAK LIBRARY SUITES. BEDROOM SUITES.

Brass and Iron Bedsteads. Spring Mattresses and Bedding.

SIBEBOARDS. BOOKCASES.
WARDROBES. OCCASIONAL CHAIRS.

WILTON, BRUSSELS, AND TAPESTRY CARPETS
OF THE CHOICEST DESIGNS.

Brocatelle, Satin, Tapestry, Rep, Cretonne, and Lace Curtains, Blankets, Sheetings, and every description of

HOUSEHOLD LINEN.

W. H. R. and Co. from their long experience in the furnishing trade, do far the largest business in Australia, which is entirely due to the cheapness and durability of their goods, and also to the efficient manner in which they turn out all orders entrusted to their care.

CATALOGUES ON APPLICATION.

J. AND A. M'KINLEY, PRINTERS,] [61 QUEEN STREET, MELBOURNE.

No. IV. *(Published Quarterly).* PRICE, 2S. 6D.

THE

MELBOURNE

REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1876.

CONTENTS:

PAGE
I. Port Phillip: A Preliminary Chapter in the Political History of Victoria - SIR C. GAVAN DUFFY, KNT., M.P. - - 385
II. Twelve Months' Leave - - - - R. L. J. ELLERY - - 410
III. Sir Richard Hanson - - - - MISS SPENCE - - - 427
IV. Abel Jansen Tasman - - - - MARCUS CLARKE - - 451
V. Shakspere: The Life and the Plays - MISS H. A. HEARN - - 458
VI. The Parts of Speech - - - - F. J. PIRANI, M.A. - - 470
VII. The Colonial Question - - - - - - - - - 476
VIII. Critical Notices - - - - - - - - - - - 497

MELBOURNE:

SAMUEL MULLEN, 55 & 57 COLLINS STREET EAST.

SYDNEY: WILLIAM MADDOCK.
ADELAIDE: W. C. RIGBY.
HOBART TOWN: J. WALCH & SONS.
LAUNCESTON: WALCH BROS. & BIRCHALL.
BRISBANE: GORDON & GOTCH.
LONDON: CROSBY LOCKWOOD & CO.

[*The right of translation and reproduction reserved.*]

J. AND A. M'KINLEY, PRINTERS, 61 QUEEN STREET, MELBOURNE.

KRUSE'S INSECTICIDE.

This Powder is unrivalled in destroying FLEAS, BUGS, ANTS, FLIES, COCKROACHES, BEETLES, GNATS, MOSQUITOS, MOTHS IN FURS, and every other species of insects in all stages of metamorphosis, whilst it has no qualities deleterious to human beings, and is quite harmless in its application to Dogs, Cats, Poultry, Pigeons, &c. In 1s. packets., and in tins, 1s. 6d., 5s., and 10s.

Sold by all Chemists and Druggists.

KRUSE'S FLUID MAGNESIA.

KRUSE'S FLUID MAGNESIA for upwards of Ten Years has been approved and prescribed by the leading members of the Medical Profession. Its almost universal use affords sufficient proof of the high estimation in which it is held by the public generally. It is carefully prepared of uniform strength, each fluid ounce contains Ten Grains of pure Carbonate of Magnesia.

Kruse's Fluid Magnesia speedily removes Heartburn, Acid Eructations, Sourness, or Irregular Digestion of Females and Children.

It composes the Stomach in a few minutes after any excess or hard drinking.

The Solution is of itself an agreeable aperient, but its laxative properties can be much augmented by taking with it a little of Kruse's Syrup of Raspberries and Lemon; in this manner a very agreeable effervescent draught can be safely taken at any time during fever or thirst.

The antiseptic qualities of this Solution, owing to the presence of so much carbonic acid have been found very valuable in Putrid, Scarlet, and other Fevers. As a lotion for the mouth it sweetens the breath, and the Magnesia cleans the teeth from Tartar.

I have used the Fluid Magnesia prepared by Mr. John Kruse with the most satisfactory results. I consider it a valuable antacid and aperient in Dyspepsia and irregularity of the bowels, and an excellent medicine for children.

With the Raspberry and Lemon Syrup it forms a grateful drink, and will relieve the flatulence and allay the vomiting which is so distressing in the early months of pregnancy.

(Signed) JAMES GEORGE BEANEY, F.R.C.S.
Surgeon to the Melbourne Hospital, &c.

Sold in Half-Pints, 1s. 6d.; Pints, 2s. 6d.; Quarts, 3s. 6d. per Bottle, by all Chemists and Druggists throughout the Colonies.

Wholesale: FELTON, GRIMWADE & CO., Melbourne.

DANCING. CALISTHENICS.

MESSIEURS & MISS ROBERTS,

Professors of Dancing, Calisthenics,

"*Maintien et de bonne tenue.*"

87 COLLINS ST. EAST, MELBOURNE, & ASSEMBLY HALL, ST. KILDA.

Receive pupils and give private instruction in the above useful and elegant accomplishments, at their "*Salle où l'on montre à danser.*" Messieurs and Miss Roberts impart to their pupils the modern and Fashionable Style of Dancing, as taught by the most distinguished professors in London and Paris, and approved of and adopted by Royalty and the *elite* at the Court Balls, *les reunions dansantes* in Europe. Educational Establishments and private families attended. Terms and prospectuses on application.

JUST PUBLISHED.

Roberts's Manual of Fashionable Dancing and Vade Mecum for the Ballroom,

Containing a Review and full description of all the Modern Dances, illustrated.
by the authors, 87 Collins-st. east: G. Robertson, publisher: and all book and music sellers. 2s. 6d.

THE

MELBOURNE ATHENÆUM.

LIBRARY AND READING ROOMS,

COLLINS STREET EAST,

IMMEDIATELY ABOVE THE TOWN HALL AND OPPOSITE THE "ARGUS" OFFICE.

IN the principal Reading Room will be found Newspapers from all parts of Victoria and the neighbouring Colonies; the leading London and Provincial papers are laid on the tables immediaetly on the arrival of the English Mail Steamer.

The supply of Magazines and Periodicals, scientific, artistic, literary and amusing, is most complete, and includes every publication of note, either Home or Colonial. Of the more popular, two or more copies are supplied. These may be borrowed by members.

There is a separate Reading Room for Ladies, supplied with suitable newspapers and periodicals. Subscription per annum, Ten Shillings.

The Library is divided into two Departments—the Circulating Library and a Library of Reference. The former contains between 15,000 and 16,000 volumes which are lent to members and their families. New works are being constantly added. To many the Library of Reference will be found of value, as it contains such works as Parliamentary Proceedings, Gazettes, Encyclopædias, Men of the Time, Directories, the best Etymological and Scientific Dictionaries, &c. &c.

A room is provided for conversation, smoking, chess, &c.

Classes are held during the week, at convenient times, for instruction in French, Italian, Chemistry, Singing, Dancing, Elocution, Phonography, the subjects for the Civil Service and Matriculation Examinations, &c., to which members are admitted at a reduced scale of fees.

Lectures, on various subjects, are delivered in the course of the year, at certain of which members are privileged to attend at reduced charges.

The Subscription to the Institution, entitling a member to the whole of these advantages, is £1 per annum, or Ten Shillings half-yearly. No Entrance Fee is charged. Members can join at any period of the year.

Any further information that may be desired will be gladly rendered on application at the Institution, to

GARNET WALCH, *Secretary.*

SCOTCH COLLEGE.

MELBOURNE.

PRINCIPAL: ALEXANDER MORRISON, M.A.

VICE-PRINCIPAL: ROBERT MORRISON, M.A.,
Senior Hope Scholar, Edinburgh University,

Assisted by Twelve Regular and Eight Visiting Masters.

THE Scotch College is situated on the Eastern Hill, the highest part of Melbourne. The buildings face the Treasury and Fitzroy Gardens, and occupy a position well-known for its salubrity and retirement, and for the beauty of its surroundings. The accommodation for the Boarding School was erected in 1873, and has been constructed on the most approved principles.

"In the various examinations held during the year at the University the candidates from the Scotch College were very successful. Since last report, 25 boys were sent up for matriculation, 22 of whom have passed; 36 boys were sent up for the Civil Service, 33 of whom have passed; of the 36 candidates in English, all were successful; of 26 in Latin, 25 passed; of 36 in arithmetic, 32 passed, 4 passing well; of 33 in algebra, 29 passed, 8 passing well; of 35 in Euclid, 33 passed, 9 passing well."

During the year 1875 the pass and honour list at the University included the names of 22 different students, all of whom matriculated direct from the Scotch College. In arts three passed the first year, two the second, two the third (B.A.), one the fourth (M.A.). In medicine, two passed the first year, four the second, two the third, three the fourth. In engineering, two passed the first year, one the second, one the third. In laws, two passed the fourth year (LL.B.). At the honour examinations, one gained a scholarship, one an exhibition, two took first-class honours, four second-class honours, one third-class honours. In interscholastic matches the representatives of the College maintained its position as first at cricket and boating, and second at football.

Copies of the Prospectus may be obtained at the College, and from Mr. Mullen, Collins-street.

ST. PATRICK'S COLLEGE,

MELBOURNE.

Conducted by Fathers of the Society of Jesus.

STUDENTS PREPARED FOR MATRICULATION AND THE CIVIL SERVICE.

TERMS (PAYABLE QUARTERLY IN ADVANCE):

Resident Boarders (over 12 years) per Quarter	**20 Guineas.**
Resident Boarders (under 12 years) ,,	**16 ,,**

Of the 390 candidates from all parts of the Colony who presented themselves at the Matriculation and Civil Service Examinations, December 1873, fifty per cent. were successful in the former, and fifty-four per cent. in the latter. Of the students of St. Patrick's College who presented themselves on the same occasion, sixty-nine per cent. were successful in the former, and seventy in the latter. Of all the young gentlemen who were successful, J. F. Fitzgerald, of St. Patrick's College, obtained the highest marks.

In 1872, at a competitive examination for a place in the Mint, 121 candidates presented themselves. The successful candidate was Robert Emmett Dillon, of St. Patrick's College. He was examined in nine subjects, and passed in all.

TO BE PUBLISHED IN NOVEMBER.

"SWEET GIRL GRADUATE,"

A STORY OF MELBOURNE LIFE.

BY

ARTHUR P. MARTIN.

PRICE ONE SHILLING.

MELBOURNE: J. & A. M'KINLEY, 61 QUEEN STREET.